

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—JULY, 1892.—No. 67.

MATTER AND FORM IN BIOLOGY.

I.

THE human mind seeks for causes. To the student it is an absolute necessity, if his work deserves to be called study. Of this the vagaries of modern philosophy afford ample proof. It is true, that nearly all non-Catholics will sneer at an exemplar cause; will affect indifference to the final cause; that some will presume to question any First Cause; that most have not the slightest idea what material and formal causes may be; but all men who have not fallen to think only of phenomena have an interest in the efficient cause. The child asks what makes the grass grow, and just now men of science are asking what may be the immediate cause of the shape of organisms, either considered as units or as the sum of many parts, to each of which the same question applies. Why is the leaf of the maple five-pointed? What makes the serrated border of that of the elm? Why do we have five fingers and toes, and by what agencies are the ends of our hands and feet thus split up? Some would reply, that these are the effects of mechanical causes, not yet fully explained, by which growth is checked in certain parts and in others increased. Some, the so-called vitalists, would refer it to a vital force, which, acting from without on the organism, as do mechanical and chemical agents, has the property of bringing it into its proper shape. According to Scholastic philosophy, the form determines the structure, not, however, as an external force, but according to its nature as the life-giving agent to the matter of which the organism is composed. The very cells are not inert particles to be squeezed together or drawn out by

forces outside of them. Each lives and grows, not, however, as an independent individual, but as a part of the whole. Undoubtedly, the shape of each is dependent on the action of its neighbors. They may be pushed and pulled without injury, provided that the pushing and pulling are conducive to the arrangement that is characteristic of the parts they go to make in the organism. The form directs the development, but it makes use of the ordinary physical forces, chemical and mechanical. It is not impossible that the last clause may not always have been kept enough in sight, and the whole ascribed to the form. Such an answer is no longer (if it ever were) satisfactory. We want to know more. Those who admit the directing principle, still ask how it acts. Do purely mechanical forces take part in the process, and if so, to what extent?

Precisely what is meant by the mechanical system or theory, just now so much in fashion, is not quite so clear as could be wished. The underlying idea seems to be a protest against anything that is not mechanical, any vital principle, and, probably, any act of creation. Carried to its extent, it makes even reason and will the results of physical processes. It is not our province to expose the absurdity of such a system. We confine our discussion to the growth of organisms. Even in this narrower field the same want of clearness reigns. Some authors see only the work of mechanical forces. Others dwell on the wonderful adaptation of means to ends, showing, for instance, how admirable is the mechanism of the structures for support and motion, and in how close accord with the laws of physics. The height of their ambition appears to be to express this in mathematical formulæ. They see no evidence of design. If they do not say that the cause is mechanical, they put it aside altogether, concentrating their attention on the result. The mechanical system proper belongs to the former; the latter, though classed among its followers, can hardly be said to have a system at all. The real conflict is between the Scholastic system and Monism. Vitalism may be put aside. There is no evidence of any separate vital force. If there were one, it could not take the place of the form, and would be wholly superfluous.

It is our purpose to pass in review a number of biological phenomena, choosing by preference those of the human body, to see what light is to be gained from a study of the physical side of the question. We shall touch on many mysterious problems in passing, and suggest questions which we cannot answer.

Let us begin with the human thigh-bone. The shaft slanting upward and outward from the knee is joined above by a short neck which runs upward and inward. This, capped by a globe-shaped head, forms a ball-and-socket joint with the pelvis at the

hip. In the adult, the angle formed by the neck and the shaft is, on the average, one of about 125° . At birth, the two parts of the bone are more nearly in line. The angle is about 160° . What is the cause of the change which subsequently occurs?

It is generally taught that the weight of the body in the erect position transmitted to the heads of the thigh-bones, tends to force the necks down, thus lessening the angle. Very strong evidence in favor of this has been brought forward by Professor Humphry.¹ He examined the bones of a child who lived some years with so enormous a head (a case of hydrocephalus) that it never could have walked. It is doubtful if it could ever have sat up. In this case the neck of the thigh-bone preserved its original infantile angle with the shaft, for the simple reason that it never was subjected to the weight which should have bent it down. The process is remarkably well stated by Humphry: "During development, pressure and growing force combine, in what may be called a harmonious antagonism to effect the desired size and form." To some extent, different parts of the developing body act on each other as external forces. When the bones of the vault of the immature skull meet along their edges each checks the growth of the other. Thus, very long heads are due to the premature union of the parietal bones in the middle line so that the growing force expends itself in a forward and backward direction. Returning to the hydrocephalic child, we find that the bones of the head are abnormally large. The reason is, that the fluid in the head kept them apart, preventing them from mutually checking each other's growth.

Thus we have two illustrations of the effect of the purely mechanical resistance of parts of the body on the development of other parts. But as we watch these and similar processes, we soon see that living matter reacts very differently from lifeless matter to certain mechanical influences. In the first place when the weight of the body has sufficiently bent the neck of the thigh-bone the process stops, except in unfortunate cases when the bones are wanting in earthy salts. The habitual bearing of weight will make the healthy bone stronger and more rugged than a life of idleness. It is a well-known fact that mechanical action from without which would wear away an inorganic substance will strengthen the growth of an organic one, provided, of course, that it be not excessive. Not only does muscle grow stronger by work, that is by overcoming resistance, but the points of its attachment to bone grow also. The raised line of its insertion, scarcely to be felt on a weak bone becomes a rough ridge on a

¹ *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology*, vol. xxiii.

strong one. This is brought about by mechanical forces, but it is not a purely mechanical process. Whatever is received, is received according to the nature of the receiver. It is by the vital principle¹ of the organism that forces which would otherwise be destructive become salutary.

Although we propose not to stray far from the development of the individual (ontogeny), we must refer to the fact that mechanical explanations are given of the changes occurring in the alleged ancestry of any species (phylogeny). Professor Macalister writes as follows in his "Text-Book of Human Anatomy:" "Mechanical environing conditions are the chief factors which determine and modify the growth of bones. Along the lines of pressure, bones become thickened and dense; along lines of tension, they become elongated and projected. With unilateral pressure, they become curved; with oblique and terminal pressure, twisted. These characters are hereditarily impressed upon bones, and we can even trace the outcome of ancestral experience in the directions in which the primary spicules are formed." Professor Cope² has attempted to explain the shape of bones by purely mechanical causes. He labors to show that both in the joints and in the length of the bones we see the results of gradual changes clinched by heredity. Whether acquired features are inherited is still a disputed point, but Professor Cope settles the matter thus: "if they are not inherited there is no evolution." This is true enough if evolution is necessarily brought about by the accumulation of minute changes. There is a system of evolution which does not require this impossibility. But let this pass. It is rather surprising to find that this author accounts for the lengthening of bones by two precisely opposite causes. He would have the long arms of apes arise by stretching from the weight of the hanging body, and again he accounts for the lengthening of certain bones in the hind limb of bounding mammals by the effect of repeated impact. If we admit this latter explanation, it is only another and an admirable example of the influence of the form, and of the difference between living and non-living matter. If pounding makes the bone grow, it can only be because the growing force is within, and its action is increased or modified by external conditions. In the same way the nature of the motion of one bone on another is said to determine the kind of joint between them. How can it do so if there be not in the parts, at the very least, a faculty of receiving adaptation, which is one of the characteristics of a living organism?

The internal structure of bone is not less interesting than the external. If we divide a long bone lengthwise we find that the

¹ We use the term "vital principle" as synonymous with "the form."

² *The Journal of Morphology*, vol. iii., 1889.

shaft is a hollow cylinder. Much greater strength is thus obtained than if the same amount of bone were moulded into a solid column. Towards the ends, the thick walls become thin. The cavity they inclose is filled with a network of bony plates and rods known as spongy-bone. If thin slices be made of this bone in the proper directions, it is found not to be a meaningless tangle but to present a well-planned architectural arrangement. This has been studied in much detail in man and animals. A much-quoted instance is that of Professor Culmann designing a crane, the stress lines of which corresponded very closely with those of the neck of the human thigh-bone. How has this distinctly purposeful structure been produced? To call it the work of chance is really too absurd. Let us suppose that a change has occurred in the surroundings of a certain animal which would make it for his advantage to have a longer neck for his thigh-bone. The longer neck, of course, requires a new disposition of the plates of bone within it representing the stress-lines. The reasonable way to account for the occurrence of such a change is that by a law of growth, in other words by the action of the form, these plates appear in their proper places, the change of outward shape and inward structure going on *pari passu*. It is not credible that the desirable change should have been brought about solely by the mating of animals somewhat more favorably built than the others, and the gradual accentuation of the advantageous peculiarities. Further it is incredible that by this process alone the longer necks of the femurs should always have the correct internal stress-lines. What a long series of generations would be required to perpetuate this piece of good fortune in the matter of only a single point in the animal economy! The race must in the meantime have dwindled almost to extinction, for the bones of those animals that did not have the luck to get correct stress-lines must have broken down from weakness, or have grown over heavy from an excess of incorrectly disposed bone.

Let us return from the origin of the peculiarities of the species to that of those of the individual. Assuming that the causes above mentioned may have modified the species, they cannot work in the embryo. Rotary motion cannot cause a ball-and-socket joint, nor angular motion a hinge joint, for the joints appear in the tiny limbs before the muscles that move them are fairly developed. As Macalister points out, the early-formed spicules of bone take the proper position. To account for this, heredity, that somewhat overworked *deus ex machinâ*, is invoked. That it has its share in the process we do not doubt, but it is that of a modifying agent. It cannot be a prime mover.

Here is another instance. Very abstruse calculations have been

made on the calibre of the arteries; on the laws regulating the place for the giving off of branches; of the sum of the calibres of the branches compared with the calibre of the parent trunk; of the thickness of the walls; of the elasticity of the coats, etc.; showing in some respects most wonderful adaptations to the laws of hydrostatics. But when we watch the development of the early capillaries, we see nothing that points to any mechanical action suggesting, or corresponding to, that of fluid in motion. Certain star-shaped cells in the tissues enlarge; their slender prolongations join with those of their neighbors; the cell contents break down, leaving a cavity and forming the blood; the cavity enlarges, extending into the prolongations which become hollow tubes, and thus an early system of bloodvessels is formed. They grow larger and form systems according to a predetermined plan, but not always the systems of the mature animal. Though in the main the difference is due to the peculiar needs of the developing body, certain changes occur from unknown causes. Certain vessels are obliterated, and others persist without any advantage that we know of. Occasionally, a vessel that should be lost survives, or *vice versa*, and we find what we call an anomaly of the arteries, which is usually easy to understand by one who knows the ground-plan. Very probably some quasi-accidental mechanical process has deflected a part of the current from its usual course, thus causing the decline of one vessel and the rise of another. Still, two facts stand forth clearly: 1st, that the plan of the bloodvessels is not the result of hydrostatic laws; 2d, that it is for future rather than for present needs. None the less at times purely mechanical forces may intervene. When a mammal first breathes the arterial blood which till then was shot from the pulmonary artery through a tube, the *ductus arteriosus*, into the aorta, rushes instead to the lungs. The useless, or rather the now dangerous, communication with the aorta is soon closed. The mechanism is thus explained by a recent German observer:¹ The first act of respiration changes the position of the pulmonary artery. The raising of the breast bone and the fall of the diaphragm change both the direction and the calibre of the duct. Folds appear inside it. Later its cavity assumes an hour-glass shape, and soon it becomes impervious. Schanz produced similar longitudinal folds in the duct by blowing up the lungs of an immature embryo. Assuming that this explanation is correct, we have here a distinctly mechanical process; but it would be stark madness to suppose that it was simply by chance that the parts were so disposed that this desirable action should occur thus opportunely. This must be the work of a principle presiding over growth.

¹ Schanz, *Archiv für Gesampt. Physiologie*, bd. xliv., 1888.

A very curious instance of the mechanical action of certain internal structures in determining the disposition of others, and also of the tolerance of the more passive parts to the action of the first, is furnished by the recurrent laryngeal nerves which supply nearly all the muscles of the larynx. The great pneumogastric nerve emerges from the base of the skull, and runs down through the neck and chest to the stomach. Shortly after leaving the skull it gives off the superior laryngeal nerve, which runs downward to the larynx, where it is distributed chiefly to the mucous membrane, but the main trunk passes by the larynx down into the chest without giving any other branch to the larynx. The right pneumogastric nerve passes in front of the subclavian artery behind the collar bone; the left one in front of the arch of the aorta, which lies deeper in the chest. At these points the inferior laryngeal nerves are given off. They curl backward under these vessels, and then run upward along the windpipe to the larynx, thus deserving the name "recurrent." Two things in this arrangement seem very peculiar: 1st, that the nerve to the larynx should be given off so late from the parent trunk that to reach its destination it must describe a long and apparently useless retrograde circuit; 2d, that if it is to make a loop at all, the left one should not turn under the left subclavian artery symmetrically with the right, instead of under the still more remote arch of the aorta. These two peculiarities have a common cause. At an early stage of embryonic life the heart lies under the head, from which it gradually recedes. Five arterial arches on either side are developed in front of it; that is, still nearer the head. These, which are generally regarded as corresponding to the arteries of the gills in fishes and amphibians, are called the branchial arches. The pneumogastric nerve runs before this system of arches, and as it passes the last one sends beneath it the inferior nerve to the larynx. As these arches descend lower and lower into the chest, the point at which the nerve gets free from the parent trunk is dragged down with them, and thus it happens that in the adult it has to retrace its course for several inches (in the giraffe it must be for several feet) to reach its sphere of activity. The want of symmetry is due to the fact that the arch of the aorta, not the left subclavian, is developed from the arch corresponding to the one which forms the subclavian on the right. A very apt confirmation of the truth of this theory is given by cases in which the right subclavian artery arises irregularly. In these cases the last two branchial arches on the right either disappeared early or were never developed. Thus there was no structure to pull the right laryngeal nerve down into the chest, and accordingly it leaves the pneumogastric, perhaps as two or three different bundles of fibres, as the main trunk passes the larynx and

runs there directly. One could hardly imagine a more perfect demonstration of the theory that the origin of the nerve is drawn down into the chest by the artery. Yet the process is not a purely mechanical one. If in later life a man suffers from a dilatation (an aneurism) of the arch of the aorta or of the right subclavian, a common symptom is the paralysis of the muscles of the half of the larynx on the side of the disease. This is due to the injury to the nerve fibres as they curl under the artery; but the pressure to which they are subjected would seem to be far less, and the resistance of the nerve far greater, than when its hardly formed fibres were drawn so far out of place. In after life, when two structures are thus strained, one or both must suffer. In the embryo they pursue their remarkable course together, the artery does not destroy the nerve, nor does the nerve cut through the artery. The mechanical school might be tempted to reply that as this arrangement is by no means common to man but widespread throughout vertebrates, heredity has given it so firm a hold that it may be called natural; but the refutation is at hand in those cases in which the nerve does not form a loop, there being no vessel to pull it.

If we call into our service the microscope to give us a nearer view of what takes place among the elements of the developing body, we see signs of the mechanical effect of one tissue on another, and still more of a directing principle. The lung of the unhatched chick has long been a favorite object. First a single outgrowth from the gullet appears and pushes out into the surrounding tissue. Soon it divides into two tubes, one for each lung. These again divide and subdivide forming more and smaller lobules continually advancing, and destined to form the cellular lining of the bronchial tubes and air cells. But the surrounding tissue which is to form the connective tissues and bloodvessels of the lung is not idle. We see the newly-formed capillaries pressing against the epithelial cells. Two opposing forces seem to be meeting. Each triumphs at alternate points. There the epithelial cells rush forward against the vessels, and on either side the vessels rush in against the cells. Thus a wavy line is produced which grows more and more complicated as the air-cells are formed. Franz Boll¹ rejected the view that any one tissue should be considered the moulding one. He declared the process to be a conflict, and the result a compromise. From his description we see that all the elements of the tissues are alive; but what he does not tell us is that it is no blind struggle but an harmonious action presided over by a guiding and vivifying principle, the form. Were it otherwise, how slight an irregularity in the early processes would

¹ *Das Princip. des Wachstums.* Berlin, 1876.

distort the growth of the organ! How frequent, or rather how general, must be the occurrence of such irregularities were there no restraining influence! The plan of the lung would be hopelessly confused. That species should have any typical plan of lung would be obviously impossible. Evidences of this super-mechanical principle are rife, not only in normal development but under entirely different circumstances.

The artificial production in animals of monstrosities and deformities is something higher than scientific play. Dr. Wilhelm Roux undertook a series of experiments to ascertain to what extent the fertilized ovum, or even parts of it, could develop of itself; to what extent it depended on external influences. He found when a fertilized frog's egg showed on the surface a division into two halves, if one of these was injured in the proper way with a hot needle, that it remained undeveloped, and that the other half of the egg became, as the case might be, the right or left half of a tadpole. "This," writes Roux, "is certainly surprising; but what is wonderful is that at a later period the half which is entirely wanting is perfectly developed from the other. This can occur in the same way as in the regeneration of lost parts. The cells on the surface of the side of the body towards the defect increase and form such shapes that all that is wanting of the typical animal is replaced."¹ This is indeed analogous to the restoration of lost parts in animals low in the scale, and to the less perfect repair of injured parts in higher ones. It is only more striking. The more we study the process the more clearly we see that it can be accounted for by no purely mechanical system. It is fatal to the theory that each part of the body must be developed from a certain part of the blastoderm. It is fatal to any purely mechanical theory. It shows the agency of something higher.

What is this principle of growth? According to the scholastic philosophy it is the form. According to many scientists of the day it does not exist. Their efforts to get on without it are pitiable. Others admit frankly their ignorance. Thus Roux: "We do not yet know what forces are present in the fertilized ovum, nor how they are grouped, so that they are able to start the development of the individual. We do not know what combination of forces carry on this development. In short, we do not know *why* a typically formed highly complicated organism comes from a simple egg, nor why the organism thus formed is able, in spite of constant change of matter, to maintain itself for a long time comparatively unchanged."² As we have already implied, many have

¹ *Die Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen*. Eine Festrede, 1889. Also Virchow's *Archiv.*, Bd. cxiv., 1888.

² Festrede, p. 5.

raised heredity into a kind of idol, attributing to it powers beyond its sphere. There is something almost pathetic in the way that a positivist anatomist appeals to it to explain the origin of the arrangement of the convolutions of the brain and at the same time admits the weakness of the explanation. "To sum up, as the morphogenic explanation of the folding of the surface of the brain, we are reduced to the commonplace formula that the hemispheres, passing through the various stages of their development, obey this *quid ignotum* called heredity which stamps each of our organs with its specific seal. The reader will admit with us that this is no explanation, and the formula in question can hardly satisfy a positive mind seeking not words but clear and precise answers."¹

Very probably he would retort on us that the scholastic doctrine of the form is not a whit more satisfactory. Generations have laughed at the last act of the *Malade Imaginaire* when the hero replies in his examination to the question why opium causes sleep: "*quia est in eo virtus dormitiva.*" The sarcasm of the enthusiastic applause of the chorus: "*bene, bene, bene, bene, respondere*" was perhaps as much directed at the philosophy as at the medicine of the day. Professor His² parodies it in this connection. Such replies as ours to the question why protoplasm can develop into certain organisms amount to saying: "*quia est in eo virtus formativa.*" The comparison seems to us perfectly just. In neither answer is there the slightest explanation of the mode of action of the *virtus*, be it *dormitiva* or *formativa*. The difficulty is in the limitation of our powers. With many persons it is made greater by the error of confounding the imagination with the understanding. We recognize the truth of many things which we cannot represent to our imagination. For instance, it is certain that we see. It is easy to prove that matter pure and simple cannot see. Therefore there is something besides matter that is essential to sight. The fact that we do not in the least know *how* we see does not weaken the force of the argument. In the same way it can be proved that the doctrine of a form (or soul) by which animals and plants grow into their proper shape is reasonable, though we remain in ignorance of its *modus operandi*. The question is not in the least a new one in metaphysics, but the growth of the study of biology has brought it before a new audience and calls for its discussion from the physical standpoint. In the days of St. Thomas there were no means of studying the physical phenomena. Perhaps they were passed by too easily; but it is hard to judge justly in such cases. They were not ignored, for the scholastic system recognized fully the share of matter in the process; but they were treated

¹ L. Testut, *Traite d'Anatomie Humaine*. Tome ii., p. 476, 1891.

² *Unsere Körperform*, 1874.

from the metaphysical standpoint. At that time it could hardly have been otherwise. It is likely enough that advancing science will show us one mechanical process after another, and drive further and further back the super-material action, but it is safe to say that it can never be dislodged. It will be seen to act as a director of processes, even if all the processes themselves should prove capable of strictly mechanical statement. Professor His's theory of "imparted motion" may have a great future before it, but it will never free itself from the need of a directing principle. Indeed, this leader of embryologists in a recent paper of great value¹ declares his belief that all efforts to find in matter alone the solution of the problems of generation and growth must fail. He concludes as follows: "The interaction, according to law, of numberless individual processes makes every degree of development the result of preceding and the conditions for future degrees; but on our mind it makes the impression of that internal order for which even to-day the old definition of Leibnitz, pre-established harmony, is the most fitting." One is tempted to wonder whether aught but prejudice could lead such a man to see in this theory any superiority to that of matter and form.

II.

Let us turn to some of the difficulties, real or apparent, connected with this teaching. In the first place if there be a form, it is clear that it must act teleologically; that is for an end. As has been shown, the parts grow for a future usefulness. We do not see because at first useless organs in lower animals have luckily become eyes; but eyes develop in order that we may see. This, we know, is not the fashionable theory, but the impossibility of any fortuitous system has been so often shown that it is not worth while to repeat the refutations resting on the doctrine of chances. Still we are inclined to believe that teleologists have sometimes gone too far, and not they only, but others who see in shape only an adaptation to surrounding influences. Thus in old times we heard much of the perfection of organs and organisms which more accurate observation does not appear to have borne out. Wolff,² writing of the internal structure of bone declared that not only could the function be deduced from the shape, and the shape from the function, but that bones were made on the only possible plan. This is pure assumption. The vertebræ of an alligator are both without and within very different from those of a mammal. One, in short, is on the reptilian, the other on the mammalian plan. It

¹ *Zur Geschichte des Gehirns*, etc., Band xiv., Abhandlungen der mathemat.—physichen Classe des Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.

² *Virchow's Archiv.*, Bd. 1., 1870.

is not proved, nor in our opinion is it likely, that the static and dynamic needs of the spine of the alligator could not be met by vertebræ founded on the mammalian type.

There is a projection called the third trochanter near the upper end of the thigh-bone, which is found well marked in hooved animals with an odd number of toes, but which is wanting, or at most rudimentary in those with even toes. Thus it is met with in the horse and the rhinoceros, but not in the deer and the ox. Yet it is very hard to believe that the needs of the horse and rhinoceros are so similar, and so different from those of the deer and the ox, that it should be a necessity to the former, and useless to the latter. There are those who on such grounds unjustifiably attack the general principle of teleology. We on the contrary hold to it firmly. We merely say that it seems to us rash to apply it too strictly to details of structure, ignoring that there may be circumstances, heredity for instance, which modify the action of the form.

This brings us to certain phenomena which are claimed by the most extreme and least critical Darwinians as fatal to any non-evolutionary hypothesis. We refer to rudimentary organs, and to anomalies in which some feature that is normal in certain animals appears occasionally in man. Some of the rudimentary organs seem to admit of easy explanation; but some of the anomalies are most perplexing. This third trochanter is a case in point. It is found not rarely in the human thigh-bone. It is not due to the strain of muscles nor to particular occupations. It is found in delicate bones. It is found occasionally in savage races, among the individuals of which there was presumably no great difference in mode of life. Moreover it may be found in young persons, which proves that it is not the result of any long-continued habit or position. We have attempted to show in a preceding number of this REVIEW¹ and elsewhere, that many of the anomalies cannot be explained as reversions. Some of these animal peculiarities cannot be made to fit into any conceivable scheme of human descent. Still there must be a cause. What is it?

Modern Catholic writers seem to us to leave much to be desired in their treatment of this subject. Father Pesch² speaks of anomalies as mostly of a pathological character.

We do not think that this view is justified; but even if it were they none the less call for explanation. Father Harper³ in a note

¹ Vol. xi., July, 1886.

² *Die grossen Welträthsel*. T. Pesch, S. J. Bd. ii., s. 237. It is to be regretted that this truly admirable work has not been translated into English, and is not more generally known. It is the subject of a very interesting paper, "The Battle of Theism," by the Rev. William Barry in the *Dublin Review*, of October, 1884.

³ *The Metaphysics of the School*, vol. ii., p. 645.

accounts for rudimentary organs as follows: "But these physical facts offer no real difficulty, if we accept the doctrine of Aristotle and of the Angelic Doctor. They are the result on the matter of antecedent provisional Forms which have carried on the organization to its appointed term; and their arrest is due to the action of that higher Form which finally determined the specific nature." We shall not presume to discuss the vexed question of successive forms in the human embryo, nor shall we consider how far ontogeny is a true abstract of phylogeny; suffice it to say that if we admit both, the mystery of the occasional appearance in man of a peculiarity of a member of some distant side branch of the alleged genealogical tree still remains untouched. Professor Mivart in his excellent "Truth" says little or nothing of anomalies occurring in individual members of a species.

From anomalies to monstrosities there is but a step. We do not mean that they are of the same nature, but that it is often hard in practice to draw a sharp line between them. The subject is a vast one, which we shall not attempt to deal with. We shall refer merely to a few remarkable facts not easy to account for. If the tail of a lizard be properly cut or broken off, sometimes two, sometimes even three new ones will come in its place. If the forelimb of a triton be amputated the new one is said to have occasionally an additional finger. It would seem as if under certain abnormal conditions the form may act with excessive but ill-regulated energy. Such examples are most common among lower animals, but very extraordinary cases of reduplication of parts are sometimes found in man. Sometimes the hands and feet show not only extra fingers and toes but are clearly made by the fusion of two hands or feet on a single arm or leg. There is a very rare specimen in the museum of the Harvard Medical School illustrating this condition. It is a dissected left arm bearing seven fingers arranged as follows: First there are the four fingers of a normal left hand, but the thumb is wanting and at that side, there is a portion of a right hand bearing the little, ring and middle fingers. The hands are so placed in their fusion that the palms are on the same side, and that the line of union is between the forefinger of the left hand and the middle finger of the right. The forearm has two bones as is natural, but a glance shows that they are two ulnæ; that is, there is a doubling of the bone of the same side as the little fingers, while the radius, the bone of the thumb side, is wanting. In short, from the elbow down this man had a limb composed of the inner parts of two fused together. The origin of such deformities is extremely obscure. This is not the place to discuss the matter in detail. Suffice it to say that we incline to the hypothesis of an action analogous to that by which a multi-

plicity of lizards' tails is brought about. Should that be the case the question arises whether the matter or the form is at fault. According to the scholastic system the form does not err. Defects depend on the matter inasmuch as the form requires a proper disposition of the matter for its full and free action. In accord with this we may notice in the cases of the lizards and the tritons (perhaps also in this human arm) that the action of the form does not become erratic, so to speak, till the matter has suffered injury. Still why or how this should induce a reduplication is most obscure. If these questions are hard to answer according to the scholastic system we know of no other that makes them easier. It is quite as impossible that matter alone, without a directing form, should develop into the inner halves of two forearms fused together as into the normal limb. Other and, perhaps, still more puzzling cases might be mentioned. Nothing is further from our thought than to imply that the system of matter and form makes clear even the simplest of the problems we have before us. The point we wish to emphasize is that, though not clear to our imagination, this system is satisfactory to reason. There is no conflict between it and the observations of physical science. It shows that life is the result of an immanent force. External forces (counting as such the physical properties even of internal parts of the organism) can and do modify, but cannot originate. That the mode of action of the form is beyond us is not a defect of the system but the consequence of our limited powers. After all what process of physical forces even in non-living bodies can we claim to truly know and understand?

THOMAS DWIGHT.

PIUS IX. AMID FRIENDS AND FOES—1848.

“IF like St. Peter I had the power to strike down men of the same character as Ananias and Saphira, and if I willed to use that power, the Vatican would be the tomb of the diplomacy which has always deceived me.”¹ At Portici Pius IX. spoke these suggestive words, in February, 1850, just two years after the decisive *Non Voglio*. Suggestive words they are indeed to those who are seeking to know the truth about the dealings of European governments with the Papacy during the last half century. How many deceptions the truth-loving Pope must have suffered between 1848 and 1850! As for the Ananiases outside of the diplomatic body, where would he have found a mausoleum capacious enough to contain them!

Within a fortnight after the remarkable scene in the Quirinal piazza, the puppet of a revolution, Louis Philippe, was flung aside. The Carbonari, Masons, Socialists, who lifted him on a throne he was not worthy of, had long been preparing his downfall. Beginning with 1840, not a year passed in which public order was not disturbed by one émeute at least. Nowadays revolutionaries affect the “Congress.” During the forties the banquet was in fashion. No less than seventy banquets were offered the French “people” in the course of the year 1847. The French and Italian methods were similar. They were devised by the same calculating heads. At length a monster banquet at Paris was announced—a banquet for the entertainment of one hundred thousand guests. The joke was serious, more serious than Guizot knew. When the government said nay, the genial banqueters brought out their guns and bludgeons. The ever convenient barricade was scientifically builded. Banqueters that might have been, found playful amusement in the cutting of fraternal throats and the robbery of equals who surely doubted their own freedom. (February 24, 1848.) Louis Philippe retired and the convenient “republic” bowed itself into his place. And such a republic! with the sentimentally sweet phrase-maker, Lamartine, to represent it before Europe, and back of him Ledru-Rollin, Felix Pyat, Proudhon, Crémieux, Louis Blanc, the Bonapartes, and others of that ilk. The possibility of a Socialistic republic troubles cool minds to-day. In 1848 the French had a short experience of such a republic. The Socialists were the first to tire of the experiment. Blanqui, Barbès, Cabet

¹ *La Souveraineté Pontificale*, Dupanloup, p. 238, Paris, 1861, 3d ed.

demanding something more advanced—the “democratic” republic, a republic in which all men should work, except the members of the Socialist party. Once more the barricades and the madmen behind them—three days of slaughter. (June, 1848.) Seven generals, an Archbishop, five thousand guilty and guiltless are sacrificed to Socialist “democracy.” Thanks to Cavaignac who, by his firmness and courage during the three days, made up for earlier and later indiscretions, France was saved from another “Terror.”

The Paris revolution of February was only the first of a series long planned. At Vienna, on March 11th, a demonstration was made against Metternich. The windows of his dwelling were smashed. On the 12th and 13th the students and the other mob threatened more forcibly. To pacify them, Metternich resigned. On the 17th, that proper enemy of the Jesuits, Lola Montez, danced out of Munich, and her royal patron removed the crown that was worth more than his head. The Berliners tried to hide themselves behind barricades on the 18th, and regretfully Frederick William shot down two hundred of them. The Milanese surprised their Austrian governors on the same day. Before the end of the month the whole of Lombardo-Venetia, Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont, had imitated Paris,

The rising at Milan was not unpremeditated. Under Austrian rule Lombardy and Venice were well governed—governed in the interest of the people and not of a class. With the government the people were satisfied; but the aristocracy and the secret societies had long before united their forces and determined to be rid of the German. From Turin the revolutionary aristocracy of Lombardy was managed. Without the assistance of Piedmont the Austrian could not be dislodged. Charles Albert, “half devotee, half Carbonaro,” would, but dare not. The Mazzinians had made “United Italy” a watchword in the land; but Mazzini would have no king at the head of Mazzinian Italy. The revolutionary aristocrats meant to have a king, and that king was to be the Piedmontese king. To use the aristocracy to abolish kings was Mazzini’s game. To extend the power of a petty monarchy, with the aid and at the expense of the dagger revolutionaries, was the aim of Charles Albert. Piedmont had no cause of quarrel with Austria. Defeat in an unjust war the king feared. Still he greedily ambitioned the crown of Italy. The Gioberrians pushed him on, nor could he hide from his sight “the dagger of the conspirator” with which Mazzini threatened him.¹ Anxiously the king provided against a military failure; and all things being ready, he insisted that the Lombards should revolt

¹ See Mazzini’s letter of April 27, 1847.—*Life and Letters*, vol. i., p. 58.

before his army moved. A revolution at Milan was accordingly planned, the date agreed upon being the 21st of March. Meantime news came of the Viennese riots, and the Milanese leaders thought it better to hasten events. Long Live Italy! Long Live Pius IX! Long Live the Sovereign Pontiff! With these calculated cries Milan was aroused on the 18th of the month. Radetzky, taken unawares, retired ingloriously. On the 20th a provisional government nominated itself and issued a manifesto under "the invocation of Pius IX." How deeply the aristocrats venerated the Pope!

Charles Albert was not ready. His minister, the Giobertian Balbo, assured the Austrian ambassador of the King's friendly and peaceful intentions, and at the same time the King was rehearsing his favorite rôle: the Sword of Italy. At length, after proclaiming his desire for the independence of "our beautiful Italy," and his purpose of placing himself and his son at the head of an army for the liberation of Lombardy, Charles Albert crossed the Ticino. Noble prince! He went to give "a brother's aid to brothers. *Let there be no word of recompense; when the war is ended the fate of the beautiful country will be decided.*"¹ Just now let us sing a Te Deum, and shout: Long life to Pius IX! Pareto, the colleague of Balbo, was at the same time writing to Abercrombie, British Minister at Turin,—like all Palmerston's agents, a backer of Piedmont,—a diplomatic letter, couched in these terms: "After the events in France, the danger of an early proclamation of a republic in Lombardy cannot be concealed. The king thinks himself obligated *to take measures*, which will hinder the actual movement from becoming a republican movement, and which will relieve the rest of Italy from the catastrophes that might occur, should such a form of government be proclaimed."² How many Ananiases were there in Turin? Time will tell. And here a suggestion, happily made by Léopold de Gaillard! The King of Sardinia is about to "take measures." From this time on you will see that the politics and the policy of the Piedmontese monarchy have a single end—to *take* something, and to take without right, and with the generous motive of protecting *the rest* of Italy against possible catastrophes. Altruism personified!

As soon as Charles Albert entered Lombardy, a swarm of raw recruits, idealists, brigands, patriots, Carbonari, Young Italians, and also of regular soldiers, followed him. From Naples they came, and from Tuscany. His whole army numbered a

¹ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 196.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 195; Van Duerm, *Les Vicissitudes Politiques*, p. 181; *L'Expédition de Rome*, Leopold de Gaillard, p. 48.

hundred thousand fairly equipped though imperfectly organized men. Bands played the Hymn of Pius IX. The Pope's name glittered on flag and banner. A crusade, the anti-Austrian war was called. Many of the soldiers wore a cross on the breast of their uniforms. Under the protection of Heaven and with the blessing of the Pontiff, thus Charles Albert proclaimed, he set out to *take* Austria's provinces. Outside of his own territory, the Pope's name was still a convenience to the Ananiases. And at Rome, were the revolutionists, perhaps, once more using the Pope's good name to further their evil designs? Let us recall the facts that make up the history of Roman politics since the night of February 11th.

The Constitution fever was raging. The Italians caught the disease. One after another the princes supplied the quieting prescription—first, Charles Albert (Feb. 8th), and then Pius (March 14th). "Provided that religion be safe, we shall refuse no necessary innovation," said the Pope. "In our country a constitution is not a new thing. The States that have one to-day, copied it out of our history. Since the time of our illustrious predecessor, Sixtus V., we have had, in the Sacred College, a chamber of Peers."¹ The idea of a constitution may indeed have been suggested by the history of the Church; but the constitutions in vogue were not at all churchlike. Doctor Brownson's words fit them precisely: "constitutions drawn up with 'malice aforethought,' having no support in the habits and traditions of the people who are to live under them."² The Pope questioned the wisdom of a constitution, and would have preferred to see how his neighbors accommodated themselves to their new "statutes," but in the interest of peace he was ready to go to the farthest limit that conscience would permit. Each concession that he made was, however, only a new weapon placed in the hands of the desperate men who had sworn to destroy the Papacy.

To a war with Austria the revolutionaries had long looked forward. Again and again had they tried to embroil the Pope with the emperor. A division between these rulers would have pleased the Roman "patriots" better than this Piedmontese campaign. The Mazzinians guessed at the recompense which a victorious Charles Albert would demand. Assuredly he would not forthwith resign in favor of the socialistic republic. Still any war was better than none. It could be used to ruin the Pope. Either he must fight Austria, and thus, probably, cause a schism, besides making a powerful enemy and weakening his means of defence against domestic foes. Or he must refuse to fight, and thus draw upon

¹ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 175; Balleydier, *Hist. de la Révolution de Rome*, p. 61.

² *Liberalism and the Church*, p. 77.

himself the hatred of all the infuriated "patriots" in Italy and unite them more defiantly against his powers, spiritual and temporal.

The pressure brought to bear on him did not move Pius IX. He refused to declare war. "Our name," he said, "has been blest throughout the world for the first words of peace that went forth from our lips; assuredly it could not be so, if words of war came from them."¹ He did, however, act as a sovereign, careful of his rights. An army of 17,000 men was despatched to the frontier to protect his territory from invasion (March 23d). Across the Po the commander was forbidden to move. He was a Piedmontese, Durando by name, and his chief adjutant was another Piedmontese, Massimo d'Azeglio. Painter, poet, novelist, d'Azeglio was now a politician, a "liberal," loving the Church devotedly, the Pope and the Papacy extravagantly, and himself somewhat more. In Piedmont his family had not despised office. By tradition, d'Azeglio was a staunch monarchist, devoted to the crown and filled with its ambitions. Like Gioberti, he thought he was the only man who could manage the affairs of the Church in the nineteenth century. He wrote and spoke much in a warning way, exposing all the "deficiencies" of the Papal government, appealing to the Pope to do what d'Azeglio told him, and thus lead the world. He was an *Italianissimo*, bitterly anti-Austrian, and looked upon war against Austria as a Christian act that any Pope might be proud of. As a negotiator with the secret societies he had helped to "harmonize" various political interests. Indeed, d'Azeglio was a typical "harmonizer," always ready to give away valuable things, not in his charge, for a handful of nothing. At Rome he had been recently attending banquets, and making fine patriotic speeches to the multitude. He was somewhat wiser before he died. Durando he had presented to the people from a balcony, as "the sword and buckler of Italian independence." Charles Albert was satisfied with being called "the sword." The Reverend Father Gavazzi, the Barnabite, with other patriotic priests—Ugo Bassi for instance—followed Durando and Azeglio to the frontier.

The generals of the Papal army had accepted a trust, with the intention of violating it. Arrived at the frontier, the Piedmontese, Durando, issued an address to his army, speciously conceived. "Radetzki is making war on the Cross of Christ," said the truly Christian general. "Hence, soldiers! it is becoming, and I have ordered, that all of us should carry the Cross of Christ upon our breasts. All those who belong to the army of operation will bear it on the heart, as I myself do."² The Ananiases of diplomacy

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 211.

² Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 109.

could not have done much better. In order that the soldiers should not mistake the fact that Durando, d' Azeglio, Bassi and Gavazzi were really engaged in a crusade, the old cry: "Dieu le veut!" was made the war-cry, and against the Pope's express command his army crossed the Po, and joined the Venetian insurgents. The Mazzinians were audacious. Treachery to the Papacy they counted a virtue. And yet these "patriot" traitors were not pure Mazzinians, but, on the contrary, true "liberal" sons of the Church—the *free Church*.

Five days after the Piedmontese Papal general's proclamation, Pius IX. protested. "The Pope," said he, "does not speak by the voice of a subaltern." But Durando's action was well received by the clubs, and they agitated the Holy City as only they could. Meetings, petitions, committees, there was no end of. The holy war,—the "people" demanded the holy war; and the Pope ought to open the Roman campaign by excommunicating the Austrians. Cicerruacchio, the perjured Carbonari, the patriot priests, the coward nobility were especially desirous that the spiritual weapons of the Papacy should be turned against the Austrians.

What could Pius do with these traitors and energumens? Nothing beyond making his record right before the world. He spoke often, but he prayed more often. On April 29th he delivered the famous allocution by which he relieved the Papacy of any responsibility for the anti-Austrian war. "We hold on earth the place of Him who is the author of peace, the friend of charity, and faithful to the obligations of our supreme apostolate, we embrace all countries, all peoples, all nations, with an equal sentiment of paternal love." The crusade that Pius ever preached was a crusade of peace, concord, charity. His intense desire for peace can be measured from the letter sent on May 3, to Ferdinand of Austria. "With an affection wholly paternal," writes the Pope, "I exhort you to withdraw your arms from a war which cannot possibly reconquer the hearts of the Lombards and Venetians, but which must bring in its train war's hateful calamities. The generous German nation will not find it amiss that I should invite an exchange of domination, depending only on the sword, for amicable, neighborly relations. We are confident that a nation so legitimately proud of its own nationality, will not put its honor to a bloody trial as against the Italian nation, but will rather recognize the latter as as a sister."¹

Austria gave ear to the Pontiff's prudent words of warning. Pius wrote to the Piedmontese king, counselling peace and offering mediation; and had Piedmont wished peace, peace it could

¹ Van Duerm., *loc cit.*, pp. 185-186.

have had, "without the danger of an early proclamation of the republic in Lombardy." It is true that the Mazzinians were opposed to peace, and by means of local risings in the Tyrol and in Dalmatia tried to irritate Austria beyond the possibility of peace. And yet Austria made extraordinary efforts to reach an arrangement with Charles Albert. As early as May 24th, negotiations were opened through Lord Palmerston, Austria offering to give up Lombardy, provided a settlement of the debt could be agreed upon; nor did the emperor cease the negotiations until the beginning of July, when it became evident that England as well as Piedmont desired no peace on any terms other than forced terms.¹ The defeat and disgrace of Austria, Palmerston hoped for. A victory that should protect "the rest of Italy from catastrophes that might occur," was Charles Albert's dream. The great sacrifices to which Austria was willing to submit, were looked upon as proofs of weakness. The king, with his usual bravado, talked cleverly in public about the impossibility, in a war undertaken for *Italian unity*, of accepting any conditions other than that of complete deliverance.² The Emperor took the king at his word, and the octogenarian Radetzky delivered Lombardy and Venice completely from the various Italian armies that had crusaded there during a short five months. At Custozza (July 25th), Charles Albert's sword was whipped out of his hand. "It was not a retreat, it was a flight."³ On the 6th of August, Radetzky entered Milan. Charles Albert dared not halt even there. Radetzky was received as a liberator by the people who had gained the credit of driving him out. Charles Albert the Lombards now despised. He was a traitor, they said. The Austrians, once he had crossed the river, left him to himself and the Piedmontese. His kingdom they respected. "*Italia farà da sè*," the Piedmontese king boastingly said when he began to "take measures to hinder the actual movement from becoming a republican movement." *Farà da sè*? The ex-adjutant of the Papal army, Massimo d'Azeglio, after he had seen some of the sad results of his hot-headed, destructive "liberal" agitation, informed the public he had misled, that: "Italy was not prepared in mind, heart, morals, or military habits."⁴ And what had the Durandesque Papal army done for united Italy? With the Cross of Christ on their hearts, what should the "Roman" soldiers not have done? In May, the Austrians drubbed them soundly, but then let the prisoners free on their promise to return to their own territory and to fight no more. Durando broke his promise. Early

¹ Van Duerm., *loc cit.*, p. 187; Cantu., *loc cit.*, p. 221.

² Cantu., *loc cit.*, p. 221.

³ *Une Année de ma Vie* (1848-1849); Le Comte de Hübnér, Paris, 1891, p. 270.

⁴ Cantu., *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 198, note.

in June they were once more beaten by Radetzky's forces, and again paroled. When the survivors did settle down on the Papal States, it is not difficult to imagine that, to the peace of the people and of the authorities, they contributed as freely as they had to rapine and bloodshed, causes of want and tears in so many dis-united Italian homes. Gavazzi, like a true chaplain, betook himself to Genoa where he tried to help the unification of Italy by organizing revolution and a republic.

It was to La Farina, the Sicilian revolutionary who found a faithful friend in Ausonio Franchi, that Pius IX said: "I am more Italian than you are, but in me you will not distinguish the Italian from the Pontiff." The allocution of April 29th had shown that Pius willed to be both Pontiff and Italian. His letter to the Emperor made plain the same fact. The Pope's desire for unity was known to the Italian princes and people. In 1847 he had invited all the Italian States to take a first step in the way of political unity by forming a Customs' Union; but he found no support. The cry for a nation had, in fact, only one of two meanings: a republic with Mazzini in Rome, or a monarchy with a Piedmontese king in Rome. The Pope! He was the victim marked for destruction by royalist and socialist. "Unity" was a convenient cover for "robbery." When offering himself to Charles Albert as a mediator, Pius wrote that he acted as "the prince of peace, but always with a view to establishing the Italian nationality."¹ Put yourself in the Austrian camp and you will not wonder at hearing German protests against the Pope's Italianism. He was indeed the only Italian prince that honestly wished and worked for the unity of the Italian nation. And because he was honest,—but mark the course of the conspirators!

On the very day after the allocution, the clubs were hotly demonstrating. The Pope was a traitor, the enemy of the Italian cause,—death to all priests! A Committee on War and a Committee on Public Security were appointed by Sterbini, Ciceruacchio, Canino. The Committee on Public Safety saw that the cardinals were hunted and jailed, that priests were beaten in the streets, and that a shameful disorder made of the Holy City a brute's cage. It was a cage. The city gates, the Castle of Sant Angelo, were picketed. Violating the mails, all the letters addressed to cardinals and prelates were opened. Ciceruacchio was appointed public lector. He read the letters to the "people." A certain Angelo Fiorentino proposed that they have a general massacre of the priests. Ciceruacchio, another Angel, affirmed his readiness to manage the affair. Perhaps it is the Italian opera that

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 213.

leads many to associate the balcony with the idea of love-making. In 1848 the balcony was a part of the Italian demagogue's luggage. Mamiani had his balcony. "No priest in the public functions!" the philosopher cried from the balcony. There were at this time in the public functions about a hundred clerics to six thousand laymen. "Down with the ministry," all the professional bawlers shouted. A new ministry there must be, or —! "You, my friends, can burn a mattress with a match, but it looks as if three days were needed to overturn a government,"¹ said Ciceruacchio, archly. The Pope was absolutely in the hands of a savage mob. They had their ministry. Mamiani, the determined enemy of the Papacy, was put at the head of the Papal government, and, of all men, Galletti took charge of the police. The public order—revolutionary order—was assured. In good time the conspirator, Mamiani, retired and was replaced by the more moderate Fabbri, whose years and moderation bore heavily on him. At length the Pope, on Fabbri's resigning, obtained a minister in whom he had some confidence, Pellegrino Rossi.

Mamiani would have no priests in the public service. Like so many philosophers, the Count was a poor logician. However, as a minister he acted logically. He proceeded to put the Pope out of the government. Opening the "constitutional" Chambers, composed almost wholly of Carbonari, Cardinal Altieri read the Pope's address, of which Mamiani had previous knowledge. The Minister had an address prepared. He frankly stated his notions about Italian unity and nationality. His Holiness, Mamiani thus dismissed: "The Pope, established and firm in the integrity of the dogmas of religion, *prays, blesses and pardons*; the Holy Father abandons to the Chambers the direction of the most important affairs of the State."² Brutus Napoleon in the Papal Ministry! And the temporal power abolished without so much as a blow! Pius protested against Mamiani's attack on the Papal rights and rejected the Minister's programme, except inasmuch as it agreed with the Constitution. The Pope not only prays, blesses, pardons, Pius said; he also *binds and looses*. Mamiani gave no heed to the Pope's words. The Minister's journal, the *Epoca*, spread his revolutionary ideas, and the Minister acted in a revolutionary manner. The Pope had refused to declare war against Austria. Mamiani incited the people to take part in the war and decreed the formation of a new reserve corps. Durando he pushed on. From the Pope, the minister demanded a solemn anathema against the

¹ Cf. Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 212; *La Rivoluzione Romana*, Giuseppe Boero, Firenze, 1850, pp. 108–111; Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 120–126.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 213; *Les Sociétés Secrètes*, par Claudio Jannet, Paris, 1882, vol. ii., p. 297; *La Rivoluzione Romana*, p. 115; Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 145.

Austrian troops—an anathema to be pronounced in St. Peter's amid draperies of black and from an altar lighted only by the gloom. No means did Mamiani omit that could excite the rabble, complicate the Pope at home and abroad, and permanently undermine the Temporal Power. When the minister resigned it was only because he counted upon adding to the Pope's difficulties. Having organized disorder, Mamiani argued that he had made it impossible for Pius to bring back order. The most imposing incident connected with Mamiani's ministry is the victory won by the Durando army. A roving troop of the Crusaders, having tramped back to Rome, made a dashing assault on a fortress within whose walls many a good soldier had fought the good fight. In a jiffy the Crusaders captured the proud citadel—the *Gesù*.

"A species of delirium took possession of men's minds in 1847." Mazzini's testimony is worthy of remembrance. Nations as well as individuals may have a delirium, a temporary madness, mania, aberration. Mazzini knew mankind well enough to know that human wits can create and spread an epidemic of delirium. "Do not allow the people to fall idly into sleep, outside the circle of the movement. Surround them always with noise, emotions, surprises, lies and feasts. Let there be disorder everywhere." These are notable words written by the founder of Young Italy, the apostle of the dagger; and he added with a devilish cunning: "Revolutionize a country one cannot with peace, morality and truth. In order to come to us, the people must be beside themselves."⁴ Delirium, in the physician's sense, is not a disease. It is a symptom of disease. Cut out truth and morality from the soul; insert lies, disorder; excite body and soul by means of noise, emotions, surprises, feasts, and you will have a complicated disease, a double delirium, a delirium physical and moral. This is the delirium we are studying—the delirium of Revolution; a frightful disorder—whose seeds are sown, developed, nurtured by men—lying, immoral, and methodically mad.

Told in detail, the story of the manifestations of the Italian delirium, during 1848, would be long in the telling. While Charles Albert was freeing beautiful Lombardy from the German, the whole of Italy was noisy, excited; noisy with the rhetoric of the demagogue, praising, attacking; noisy with the abuse bandied by rival politicians and with the rhetoric of the dilettanti and the dreamers. Everywhere the tricolor waved. The King's army carried it, against his will. In the journals any one, every one, was lampooned; the most radical doctrines were taught. Of honor,

⁴ Claudio Jannet, *loc. cit.*, p. 298.

faith, decency, self-respect, the journalist had no more than the orator. To the Revolutionaries the news of a victory or of a defeat served equally. Indeed, they manufactured defeats and victories in order to intensify "popular" frenzy. The Kingdom of Naples was turned upside down. Tuscany was a great mad-house. Here the people could boast of two governments to-day ; to-morrow of none. There the ministry that had been forced into office was promptly hooted and hissed into disgrace. Italy free, Italy independent, The King of Italy, The Italian Republic,—such were the uniting, dividing shibboleths. Archbishops were busy blessing flags and singing *Te Deums*; priests, monks, friars applauded the wildest, most blatant spouters. In the army of liberation there was more than one company of promising seminarians. After Custozza, imagine the emotions, surprises, lies, disorder! And the losses, the debts, the taxes,—perhaps the undelirious alone suffered and paid.

The "Moral Dictator of Italy," was he idle, was he neglectful of the Fatherland, while his pupils were doing such glorious work? Idle! Listen, and then answer. To free Italy without Gioberti's aid seemed ridiculous. He was elected a member of the Piedmontese Senate. Thus an end came to his fifteen years of exile. To Turin he hurried and was received with exultation. Here an example or two of the contradictions of the "law of gradation" may not be out of place. In 1847 Gioberti wrote in this vein: "What does Austria fear? Perhaps that Charles Albert or some other Italian prince may take up arms and invade Lombardy. Nonsense! Austria knows as well as others know that such an undertaking is to-day impossible, and that ideas of this kind cannot enter into, nor find a place in the mind of a prince as wise as the king of Sardinia."¹ And one of his mouthpieces later proclaimed: "He who cries 'Death to Austria, Long live the King of Italy,' is the enemy of Pius IX., and hence, a schismatic; he is the enemy of Charles Albert, and hence a rebel; he is the enemy of Christian civilization, and hence a barbarous traitor." Meantime in Piedmont they were debating about the proper form of government for the future Italian nation. Should there be a republic or a constitutional monarchy? Gioberti was clearing the way for his election. On February 26, 1848, he wrote a "gradational" letter. "I do not see a great difference between the two forms of government. A constitutional prince is nothing more than a hereditary head of a republic, and a president of a republic is only an elective prince."² A senator at Turin, the "Moral Dictator" forthwith devoted himself to a propaganda in

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 193, note.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 205, note.

favor of the anti-Austrian war. Besides he acted as the agent of the Piedmontese Ministry in carrying out their scheme of absorbing Lombardo-Venetia by a specious process called fusion; a scheme that was just about completed when Charles Albert scurried away from Custozza. Gioberti's labors were confined neither to Piedmont nor to Lombardy. The Pope's allocution had divided him from Italy. The evil must be corrected. Gioberti will go to Rome to convert Pius IX. But if the Pope decline to be converted, then the Moral Dictator will proclaim Charles Albert king of Rome.¹ Is this the work of a compound "schismatic, rebel and barbarous traitor?" No friend of Gioberti thus qualified him. The Dictator's journey to Rome was that of a conqueror. In many of the cities that were honored with his presence, the *Te Deum* was chaunted. The bells rang, the bands played. At night the houses were illuminated. Deputations waited on him; there was much emotion, much noise; there were feasts and surprises. Picture to yourself forty armed priests guarding the approach to the Reverend Dictator's sleeping room! Gioberti was particular about having at least one balcony convenient, and he preferred lodging directly on the public square. Deprive the dear people of a speech, the soft hearted moralist could not.

At Rome he was treated quite as if he were a Giobertian Pope. The civic guard patrolled the street in front of his hotel. Equipages were provided by the nobility. In his honor a street was re-named. Professors and students crowned with laurel and olive "the philosopher who was second to none of his contemporaries." A café was called after him. Ecclesiastics paid court to the patriot. Crowds followed him, cheering, as he paraded the streets pompously. The Pope thrice granted him audience. Pius was not converted; but he gave some good advice to Gioberti. Retract your errors and repair the scandals done to the Church by your writings,—thus the Pope advised the Dictator. But he, going out on the balcony, told the people how well-disposed he found the Pope to the Italian cause, and having relieved himself of many *Evvivas*, passionately thundered against the King of Naples. The homeward journey was a continuous demonstration. Everywhere the Dictator sounded the praises of Charles Albert; and yet, at Genoa, the king's partisan paid a visit of "veneration" to Mazzini's mother, and at Milan he changed his quarters in order that he should be under the same roof with the Carbonaro president. These beautiful actions may have been inspired by a deep sense of the responsibility of the priestly office. When Gioberti's journey

¹ Antoni Rosmini, von Franz Xaver Kraus, *Deutsche Rundschau*, April, 1888, pp. 65-66.

was over, be sure the delirium had not moderated. If the people were more than ever beside themselves, no sane person would be surprised.

Balbo, the popularizer of "Il Primato," a thorough Giobertian, was a prime mover in the anti-Austrian campaign. As chief Minister of the Piedmontese cabinet, he enjoyed the honor of declaring war; and to him the success of the so-called fusion was due. But divisions and disasters proved fatal to him, and he was forced to resign. On July 29th a new ministry was formed with Casati at the head. Gioberti entered the cabinet and was recognized as the real leader. This ministry lived ten days. Gioberti now became the leader of the opposition, a *democrat*. As an "Albertist," he had "stumped" Italy. Within a few weeks he is practically a Mazzinian. He had not changed, of course. Had he not said that he saw no difference between a constitutional monarchy and a republic? To the clubs he now appealed, and he supported the ultras who demanded an immediate renewal of hostilities against the Austrians. The demand was laughable, and, in the true sense of the word, unpopular. In fact, the Lombard people did not desire a war, which was the work of "the unnatural alliance between the aristocratic party and the secret societies." Neither the agricultural nor the middle class loved a lord.¹ The people's opposition to the war was officially established by the Piedmontese general. It was on August 9th that Charles Albert, beaten, secretly dodged out of Milan, and hid himself in Alexandria. Two days later General Salasco signed an armistice with the Austrians. At Turin he was accused of exceeding his powers. His answer is telling: "The people make insurrections, and soldiers fight in wars. Now this was a war, and since the people did not move and gave no sign of acting, and because the soldiers showed themselves disordered and recalcitrant, our only safety lay in a suspension of arms."² Nor did ministers fail to give evidence that even in Piedmont the war was not a people's war. "The soldiers march away Italians and return Austrians," said Perrone, Minister of War. Brofferio, an irreconcilable, with whom Gioberti joined in an attempt to force later ministries to renew the war, confessed in writing, that "the army did not wish war, at any price."³ The "people" of Piedmont and Lombardy escaped the delirium.

Gioberti did not desire war. He was merely using the "law of gradation" so as to overthrow a ministry. The disasters in Lombardy set all the practised tongues in Piedmont wagging. In parliament deputies baited ministers, ex-ministers, and fellow deputies.

¹ Comte de Hübner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 173-174.

² Cantu, *loc cit.*, p. 227.

³ Cantu, *loc cit.*, p. 261, and note.

Balbo, the once "popular" Balbo, felt safe in his seat because of the dagger he carried. To the friends who had glorified him, the "Moral Dictator" proved false. Combating them, he united with the revolutionaries of Rome, Naples, Tuscany. The idea of an Italian Federation was not novel. On Pope and prince, Gioberti had long pushed an artful scheme of his own devising. Now, he adapted his scheme to suit the Mazzinians; and, on October 10th he gathered at Turin a "Federative Congress." The purpose of the Congress was to provide for the "calling of a Constituent Assembly of all the Italian States, the sole authority of the Assembly being to draw up a federal pact which, respecting the existence of each state, and leaving unchanged the forms of government, would serve to assure the liberty, union, and independence of Italy, and to aid the well-being of the nation."¹ A clever scheme! The character of the Congress may be judged from the fact, that the revolutionary clubs everywhere elected deputies and sent them to Turin. Rome was represented by the Bonaparte prince, Canino, with Mamiani and Sterbini. A federal pact fabricated by these three statesmen would have assured the everlasting well-being of any country. The journey of the Roman deputies was like Gioberti's "Albertist" swing around the circle,—noise, emotions, surprises, lies, and feasts. Would that the Congress had not intensified the delirium by methods more criminal!

Only six days before the opening of the Congress, strange to say, a prominent Italian resigned a quasi-mission to which Minister Gioberti had appointed him—a mission to the Pope. The missionary was no less a personage than the Abbate Antonio Serbati Rosmini, who had been negotiating at Rome for a confederation of the Italian states. Rosmini was himself a limited moral dictator, and he tried to play so considerable a part in Italian politics that he deserves more than a passing word. A friendly "Life" of the priest, politician, and philosopher, has been prepared for the benefit of English readers, and we have within reach friendly studies of his philosophical system, and translations of a few of his many books. It is Ausonio Franchi, however, who has presented the latest and the most original criticism of Rosmini's philosophy and politics. The great critic knew Rosmini as well as Gioberti. Laboriously working his way out of Mazzinianism and Rationalism, and year by year correcting his own errors, Ausonio put several contemporary Italian philosophers into the crucible. Coming from a specialist, the results of his analysis are valuable. Until recently, any one who could not admire everything that Rosmini did and wrote, might expect to be called a "jesuit." Ausonio has spoiled the trick.

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 232.

Not far from Trent, in the Austrian Tyrol, at Roveredo, among the vines and the mulberries of the beautiful valley of Lagarina, Rosmini was born in 1797. The Rosmini family were patricians, tracing their lineage back at least four hundred years. According to all accounts, Antonio was an infant phenomenon; "a reflecting child at two years of age, an alms-giving boy at five, a most studious youth at seven, a practical ascetic at twelve, a brilliant moral essayist at sixteen, and such a proficient in philosophy at eighteen that his professor became his disciple; marvellously gifted all his days from the cradle to the grave."¹

Before Antonio had attained the age of five he was *thoroughly* versed in the Sacred Scriptures, his biographer says. From a child so fully equipped at five years of age, what may we not expect when, ceasing perhaps to be a child, he reaches fifty? The possibilities are astounding. A studious and pious youth was Rosmini. At seventeen, he determined to be a priest. Then he began the study of philosophy under Don Pietro Orsi, a graduate of the University of Vienna. Rosmini spent a good portion of one whole year with Don Orsi, and, as we have seen, was teaching Orsi before the year ended. These absorbing philosophical studies did not hinder Antonio from writing "profound reflections on Dante's '*Divina Commedia*,' and comments on the '*Monarchia*,' which were deemed beyond the powers of one so young and so little acquainted with actual politics."² Nor did the youth rest here. "He wrote *learnedly* on mathematics and literature." At the end of 1816, Antonio entered the University of Padua; six months later, the degree of A.B. was conferred on him, and then he took the tonsure. In 1819, he finished his studies at Padua, and, his father dying, succeeded to the family estate. On April 21, 1821, he was ordained a priest. Even before his ordination, he had given practical proof of a deep interest in education, and the nobility of his own section and of Piedmont invited his assistance in an apostolate of the press. He gladly worked with them, and besides wrote some little books of religious instruction. From 1821 to 1826 Rosmini lived at Roveredo, especially engaged in harmonizing the truths of all the philosophers of all times. He read and wrote much, and engaged in many charitable works. The year 1826 was mostly spent at Milan in the society of literary men, of whom Manzoni was the leader. During this year and the following, the Abbate published several philosophical and educational essays, and, what was of more importance, took the first steps towards founding a religious order—the Institute of Charity.

¹ *Life of Antonio Rosmini Serbati*, edited by William Lockhart. London, 1886. vol. i., p. 11.

² *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 39-40.

Madame Canossa, a friend of the Abbate, who had established at Milan a religious Order of Charity for women, incited him to organize a similar order for men. He hesitated, but at length felt that he was called to the work, and, in February, 1828, opened a small convent at Domo d'Ossola, not far from the Lago Maggiore. During the following year, Rosmini passed through the press, at Rome, the "*Nuovo Saggio on the Origin of Ideas.*" Writing, travelling, teaching,—he served a year as parish priest at Roveredo,—seven years ran by. The convent of Domo d'Ossola was removed to Stresa, on the Lake, in 1836. Not until 1838, did the rule of the Institute of Mercy receive approbation at Rome. From 1839 to 1846, Rosmini remained at Stresa, watching the Institute, receiving the visits of eminent foreigners, carrying on a large correspondence, and, at the same time, *renovating* philosophy. To be the Renovator of philosophy was Rosmini's ambition. He intended "to produce a philosophy which should be nothing less than an encyclopædia of the entire human *knowable*—*the totum scibile*—conjoined in a grand synthesis, resting on and springing from one most simple principle, and that principle, objective truth itself, evidence itself, or self-evidence." What greater intellectual achievement could he have proposed to himself? his biographer asks. The reader may answer, specifically, if it so pleaseth him.

When first we meet Gioberti and Rosmini together, in public, it is as philosophers. Rosmini was known to the philosophical world ten years before Gioberti, but when the latter had won his spurs he tilted full at the older writer. In the "*Errori Filosofici d' Antonio Rosmini,*" printed in 1841, he resented the claim of the Tyrolese to autocracy in Italian philosophy, and passionately attacked him and his followers. He charged Rosmini with being a rationalist. When the latter made answer, in 1846, he retorted that Gioberti was a pantheist.¹ Neither harmonizer had been harmoniously disposed by the influence of his own system or of his brother philosopher's.

A story told by Father Signini, of the Institute, will indicate certain noteworthy characteristics of Rosmini's mind. "I was walking with him one day in Turin. We were on the Via delle Orfane, near the Church of San Dalmazzo, and he was in deep thought. All of a sudden he turned to me, saying, 'Oh, what would I give to have five minutes talk with St. Thomas! I am sure we should understand one another and perfectly agree.'"² Rosmini meant that St. Thomas should agree with him. And yet we know the Saint could not have agreed with the later Italian philosopher—in his errors. The patience, application, good intentions, talent,

¹ Kraus, *loc. cit.*, p. 52.

² *Life of Rosmini*, vol. ii., p. 42.

activity of the founder of the Institute are evident; but it is to be regretted that he did not content himself with following St. Thomas instead of competing with him. For he did compete with the great Saint whom he was always lauding. He tried to put himself in the place St. Thomas had for centuries held. What tempted him to aim thus high? We have the explanation in his own words. One evening, while he was studying philosophy with that Don Orsi who knew just little enough to be the pupil of his pupil, Rosmini strolled along a street in Roveredo. Speculating, he fell into a line of thought. By a process of analysis that seemed to him exact, he speedily "became convinced that indeterminate ideal being must be the first truth, the first thing seen by immediate intuition, and the universal means of all acquired knowledge, whether perceptive or intuitive." "A sudden flash of genius, if not a revelation, so illumined his course that he could clearly see 'the open portal of philosophical truth.'"¹ Now it was on this strolling "conviction" of a youth of eighteen—be it flash of genius or revelation—that Rosmini built up his SYSTEM OF TRUTH, as he called it.² "I noted down daily," he writes, "(while Pietro Orsi was my guide) the results of the artless and as yet inexperienced liberty to indulge in philosophical speculations, knowing that I thus stored up seeds which should bud forth in all the after-labors of my life on earth. *In truth, all the productions of my maturer years were the outgrowth of those seeds.*"³ Could anything be more charming in its simplicity than this naive confession? A self-confident youth—and man!

The weakness of the Rosminian system was long ago exposed. Had he studied philosophy under a competent teacher, it is probable that Rosmini would have passed a quieter life. Certainly he would not have wasted much valuable time. Ausonio Franchi makes an admirable comparison between his schooling and methods and those of St. Thomas.⁴ The boy philosopher is the real *enfant terrible*. On the airy basis of "the innate idea of the possible being," Rosmini builded his "Encyclopædia of the entire human knowable—the *totum scibile*." Rightly did Gioberti call the Rosminian principle "a soap-bubble." It was and is vain, most vain; indeed, it is contradictory and absurd, says Ausonio Franchi.⁵ Now, St. Thomas is never absurd. Therefore Rosmini did not understand St. Thomas. What Rosmini needed was five minutes' correction from the Angel of the Schools. And yet he wrote to the Secretary of Cardinal Pacca: "I am persuaded (I beg you not to charge me with presumption, for God knows

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 45, 46; see also pp. 38-39.

² *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 99.

³ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 39.

⁴ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 114-117.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 118-120.

that I do not dissemble in acknowledging myself unworthy of all favor), I am persuaded that my doctrine is from God, and that he alone communicated it to me, and I say to you also without much employment of human means and through the light of grace."¹ Not a word about the "flash of genius!" It is a revelation that we have to deal with. And yet the system is evidently absurd, and Leo XIII's condemnation of the forty propositions has buried Rosminianism! This sketch of the philosopher seemed necessary in order that, becoming acquainted with the temperament and mental characteristics of the man, we might more intelligently form a judgment on him when we see him in the rôle of a politician.

Only after the accession of Pius IX. to the Papacy did the founder of the Order of the Institute of Charity become publicly active in Italian politics. His close relations with Milan and Turin had favored an intimacy with Manzoni, who was, in fact, brought back from skepticism by association with the Abbate. Manzoni was the father-in-law of Massimo d'Azeglio. With Massimo and his father, Taparelli, Rosmini formed a friendship. The Cavours were welcome guests at Stresa; and there the Neapolitan, Ruggero Bonghi, later deputy and minister of public instruction under the unified Piedmontese administration, enjoyed the society of the agreeable priest, and such advantages as were derivable from a daily contemplation of the prodigiously large and filmy "soap-bubble"—The System of Truth. Silvio Pellico had long been a favorite at the Convent on Lago Maggiore. A Tyrolese had to be careful about expressing anti-Austrian views. However, Rosmini was not pro-Austrian and he was an Italian nationalist and unifier. Can we doubt that he had his own pet schemes for harmonizing all the political views current in Italy? And would it be astonishing if, having imagined himself the elected Renovator of philosophy and the chosen vessel of a philosophical revelation, he should assume that political wisdom had been communicated to him, through the light of grace, and "without much employment of human means?" If Pius IX. had to contend only with the diplomatic Ananiases, his troubles would have been hard enough to bear; but think of the added infliction of gratuitous, inspired Prime Ministers—without a portfolio!

As soon as there was talk of a Roman Constitution, Rosmini assumed a confidential position in the Papal Ministry. "One man there was in North Italy," his biographer informs us, "to whom many minds turned at this moment. He had written several volumes on Politics and Constitutional right, and on Constitutional Forms and Parliamentary Government, which had placed him in

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 117, note.

the first rank of Italian writers on these subjects. That man was Rosmini."¹ The conclusion is unmistakable. There was "one man" in North Italy who was not only competent but also ready to frame a proper Constitution, not for North Italy, but for the Papal States. At Rome, Rosmini had a friend, Cardinal Castracane. To him the Abbate sent a "Project of a Statute for the States of the Church." Then he wrote letters to the Pope and to his own Procurator. He stated "what he should wish the Pope to do." In answer, he was informed that the Pope had already granted a Constitution. Rosmini was not disheartened. As early as 1832 he had composed a work "on the spiritual liberty of the Church." The MSS. was now taken down from its shelf and printed for the public benefit, and especially for the advantage of the Church. Coming when it did, the *Cinque Piaghe*, or "Five wounds," was admirably calculated to serve all the enemies of the Church, and to embarrass the Pope. "Rosmini talks of the five wounds of the Church," said Gioberti. "I know ten at least." From the day it was published until the present day the "*Cinque Piaghe*" has served "liberal" innovators, who glibly rehash its ill-conceived and preposterous assumptions. In the United States more than one writer has gained the reputation of an original thinker by cribbing out of Rosmini. Theiner, answering the book, charged the author with a want of knowledge of history and of canon law, and with an incredible confusion of ideas with facts."² Cæsaropapism, as Theiner said, Rosmini would have replaced by a Popolopapism, whose lightest chains would be more galling than the heaviest the Church had borne.

After the Papal allocution of April 29th, in which Pius had declared that, "being the common Father of all the Faithful, he could not go to war with any of them," Rosmini felt deeply pained at the Pope's trials, and that at Rome no one had a notion of how to cope with the situation.³ Forthwith he began to communicate with Cardinal Castracane, hoping through him to set the Pope right. "If he, Rosmini, were near Pius IX., he would advise the Pope to join with Naples and Tuscany, and by a collective note warn Austria that if she did not leave the Peninsula, the Pope and his allies, to save their own thrones, would join Charles Albert in an Italian war."⁴ The Pope was much "struck" by this letter, as we learn from Rosmini's biographer. The founder of the Institute of Charity continued to strike the Pope with unheeded advice. His Holiness directed Cardinal Castracane to

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 331.

² Kraus, *loc. cit.*, pp. 72-75.

³ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 336-337.

⁴ See the letter, *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 337-339.

thank the Abbate,¹ who undoubtedly had been more than kind. Having devised a constitution for the Papal States, Rosmini proceeded to formulate a constitution for Italy: *La Costituzione Secondo La Giustizia Sociale, con un Appendice sul' Unita d'Italia*.² A single passage from this work will give an insight into Rosmini's politics and the depth of his political science, "The unity of Italy! Such is the universal cry, and at this cry there is not one Italian heart from the Straits to the Alps that does not palpitate. To prove the utility and necessity of this unity would therefore be to throw words to the winds: where all agree there is no question."³ Transparent, but not so very deep!

While the "one man in North Italy" was thus guiding the Church and the State, Gioberti entered the Piedmontese Ministry. We have heard him threatening to declare Charles Albert king of Rome if the Pope did not combine with Piedmont. We know that Gioberti, like Rossi and others, had a scheme for an Italian league of some sort. Once in power, the "Moral Dictator" lost no time. Piedmont was caught in its own trap. To entrap the Pope was the only hope; there was the League and there was Rosmini. On July 31st, two days after Casati and Gioberti came into power, a messenger was sent to Stresa. On the 2d of August the two philosophers—the rationalist and the pantheist—were conferring about the best means of inducing the Pope to take part in the war against Austria.⁴ The Ministry wished Rosmini to accept a mission to the Pope. The Abbate was willing, provided that his mission "enabled him to treat of all that he judged necessary or useful for the prosperity of Italy and of the Church." We can see the opportune smile on Gioberti's face as he argued in favor of accepting Rosmini's proposal. The Rosminian ideas included a Concordat with the Pope, and a league between Piedmont, Rome, Tuscany and Naples. In Rome a Permanent Diet would sit. Of this Diet and of Italian unity the Pope should be the Protector—"Moral President."⁵

Without any official instructions or credentials, Rosmini started for Rome, where he arrived on the 15th of August. Gioberti was out of the ministry a full week before this date. His brother philosopher, still without credentials, worked conscientiously and hopefully at Rome. When his credentials did arrive, they made no mention of a Confederation of States, nor of a Concordat. However, Rosmini continued to hold conferences over his Confederation. At Turin they had been making game of the founder of

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 334.

² Milan, 1848.

³ *La Costituzione, etc.*, p. 97.

⁴ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 346.

⁵ See the *Life*, vol. i., pp. 347-348; *La Costituzione*, pp. 104-110; Kraus, *loc. cit.*, p. 220.

the Institute of Charity. The Piedmontese meant to have their king—a king of Rome; and neither a diet, nor a pope protector, nor a “moral president.” Pius IX. and his minister Rossi, well knew the Piedmontese, and Rossi opposed the Rosminian scheme; but the eyes of the diplomat of Stresa, who so amusingly undertook a mission that was no mission, were not opened until he received a despatch from Turin, on the 4th of October, saying: “*Let us make a league for the war first; afterwards we will make a Confederation.*”¹ Then Rosmini resigned. Just what he resigned, the reader may have discovered—resigned himself to the circumstances. Meanwhile, the “pantheist” who had used him “opportunist,” was posing as a democrat, and organizing a revolutionary Congress. “This is the way to govern,” said Napoleon the Great as he executed a pirouette. Gioberti could not govern, but, on a small scale, he was a pirouette politician. And Rosmini? Well, founders of orders are not supposed to be skilful in the art of the ballet-dancer.

Rossi, the Pope’s minister, with whom Rosmini had to deal, was a politician, practised, experienced. At the age of thirty, he followed Murat, and had been a more loyal Carbonaro than Mazzini. Exiled, he went to Geneva, where he lectured on law, and soon obtained a place in the University as a lecturer on Roman history. During the revolution of 1830 he went to France. There he made his mark, rising rapidly: professor of constitutional law, member of the Institute, peer, count. Louis Philippe, desirous of influencing Gregory XVI. against the Jesuits, chose Rossi as Plenipotentiary at Rome, and later appointed him ambassador. Residence in the Holy City, association with Gregory, with Pius and with the leading Churchmen, corrected old errors and prejudices. The ambassador cut away from the secret societies with which he had been long affiliated. Of the righteousness of the Pope’s cause and of the iniquity of the Revolution, he became convinced. After Louis Philippe was overthrown, Rossi withdrew from active political life and used his pen and influence in favor of the Papacy.² When Pius IX. selected him to lead the Ministry, many friends of the Pope and all his foes were displeased. Rossi was no reactionist; but he meant to re-establish public order, and to straighten out the finances of the government. He reorganized the army, pursued the thieves and assassins, protected honest citizens, repressed disorder, and soon gave to Rome and the Papal States a peace long unknown. An Italian league Rossi desired, but not an Italian empire under the sovereignty of the house of Savoy. It

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 352.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, pp. 234-238; Van Duerm, pp. 193-194.

was the Pope, as we have seen, who first proposed a league. The revolutionaries and the optimists had worked industriously to popularize the idea of a republic formed of all the peoples of Italy, with the Pope as President. In the Encyclical of April 29th, Pius repudiated this hypocritical scheme. Just one month after Rosmini's "resignation," Rossi stated his own and the Pope's policy, exposing at the same time the un-Italianism of the Turin government, which "by means of the armies and the money of its allies sought to obtain *magnificent accessions*." "Pius IX. asks nothing," wrote the minister, "desires nothing but the happiness of Italy, and the regular development of the institutions which he has given to his people; but he will never forget what he owes to the dignity of the Holy See and to the glory of Rome." Why Italy should be considerate of the dignity of the Holy See, Rossi eloquently told. "The Papacy is the sole living grandeur that remains to Italy. It is the Papacy that draws to Italy the respect and the homage of Europe and of the whole Catholic world. As Pontiff, as a Sovereign, as an Italian, Pius IX. will always bear in mind this fact."¹ Had Rossi been spared, the Piedmontese monarchical unifiers and the democratic revolutionaries would have had to deal with a man of ideas and of decision.

When Rossi penned the words just quoted his fate was sealed. Unity, liberty, order, the Revolution would not hear of. At Gioberti's "Federative Congress" the leaders had condemned the Minister of Pius to death. Meeting a second time at Leghorn, the horrible cut-throats, united at the social banquet-board, had affirmed the condemnation. The Minister was judged according to the "laws" of the Secret Societies—laws whose import we have seen. Not the breast of his mother, not the altar, could have saved him. Mazzini wrote that Rossi's death was *indispensable*. The revolutionary journals hinted broadly at the crime that was to be, and even named the day. Bonaparte of Canino promised openly what quickly came. Thirty and odd "Young Italians," chosen for their hardheartedness, were divided into three sections. Out of each section of villains one was again selected. The story of the three is well known—the corpse laid before them, and each ruffian, in turn, striking with his dagger at the jugular vein. On November 15th the Chambers were to open, and Rossi was ready with his programme. Again and again was he warned; but knowing no fear, and conscious of the rectitude of his cause, the Minister would not hold back. "The cause of the Pope is the cause of God," he exclaimed, as he entered a carriage. Rossi did not know that, through the treachery of Angelo Calderari—still

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.* p. 238, note; *L'Expédition de Rome en 1849, par Leopold de Gaillard*, Paris, 1861, pp. 79-80.

another angel!—colonel of the Papal carbineers, a man who had been thirty-two years in the Papal service, and who had not only acquired rank but riches through the kindness of the Popes, he was wholly at the mercy of sworn assassins. Soldierly, guards, all had been selected to protect, not the Minister but the murderers. Arrived at the *Palazzo della Cancelleria*, he descended from his carriage. A crowd has gathered in the court and on the stairway; they stand close together; Rossi mounts; some one touches him on the shoulder; he turns—the blow was true; he falls in his own blood—the jugular is severed. In a room close by he dies within a few short minutes—time for absolution. The assassin? Not a man laid a hand upon him. He was a hero!

Sterbini, and many other deputies, were in the Chambers, expectantly awaiting. An audience of innocents and of adepts chatted in the galleries. Bonaparte enters. Coolly he announces the fact of the murder. The innocents are horrified, and express their horror. "Silence!" says Bonaparte, the anarchist. "Is the *King of Rome* dead, perchance?" The Chambers adjourned without expression of regret or resolution of inquiry. The journals either smothered the news or spoke of the murder as a patriotic act. Mamiani wrote: "The necessity of blood is repugnant to us; but, you other men of power, contemplating the death of the Minister, look to yourselves." In after years, the leaders of the revolution tried to shift from their shoulders the joint responsibility for Rossi's assassination. One charged the other with the whole responsibility. Mazzini, who gloried in murder, and who was not ashamed to give in detail an account of his purchase of Gallenga—afterwards the manufacturer for years of the Italian correspondence of the *London Times*—to assassinate Charles Albert—even Mazzini was not desirous of having the undivided credit of Rossi's death. According to the truth-loving Genoese, Mamiani, the ex-minister and philosopher instigated the crime.²

Could the fine art of murder be exercised with a purpose nobler than the stimulation of "delirium?" At once the clubs were in motion. The services of the traitor, Calderari, had not been exhausted. He placed the carbineers at the disposal of the managers. When a "popular demonstration" was on the club-programme, the Civic Guard—protector of Rome—was always convenient. Rossi's murder was celebrated in the cafés. The day was one long feast. At night, the maddened, drunken rabble was marshalled in the streets. Candle in hand, the hoarse-voiced mob

¹ Claudio Jannet, *loc. cit.*, pp. 299–300. *La Rivoluzione Romana*, pp. 126–135. Cantu, *loc. cit.*, pp. 241–242. Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 192–194. Kraus, *loc. cit.*, pp. 222–226.

² See Mazzini's *Life and Letters*, vol. i., pp. 349–353, and vol. v., pp. 378–384.

paraded, shouting, "Blessed be the hand that poignarded Rossi!" The assassin was there. Heartless men kissed his hand. The "holy dagger," thus they termed it, fixed to a staff, was lifted on high. Deliriously the inhuman throng, bearing the poignard-staff yelled their awful litany beneath the windows of the woman whom they had just widowed and of the children they had just orphaned.¹ There are "gentlemen" who would abolish Hell. They cannot, before they have passed through its adamantine gates.

Rossi's murder was but a move in the revolutionary game. The Minister dead, officials corrupted or terrified, soldiers at command, the leaders had the Pope at their mercy. The reign of law was at an end. In its place reigned the Popular Club, as Canino, Mamiani, and Sterbini had named the Fiano palace, where they daily conspired. While the rabble consoled the weeping widow, Canino and his intimates were taking means to protect the people of Rome and to direct the government of the Papal States after a proper modern and democratic fashion. All the trusted men were in council. Duly they produced an address to the people. Obeying the "unanimous wish of the country," the Popular Club demanded that the Pope should "promulgate the principles of Italian nationality, convoke a Constituent assembly in accordance with the suggestions of Gioberti's democratic Federative Congress,"² and accept Mamiani's measures for an anti-Austrian war. Long live Italy! Hurrah for the rights of the people!

To carry out this programme a competent ministry was necessary, and, therefore, the "people," unified in the Popular Club, nominated a ministry. The persons chosen should not be forgotten: Mamiani, Sterbini, Galletti, Campello, Saliceti, Fusconi Lunati, Sereni. In the hands of the famous trio of Ananias and Judases, the delirious people were sure of agreeable occupation. On the 16th of November a demonstration was organized at the Club. Shortly after midday, with bands playing and flags waving, a procession of civic guards, carbineers and "people" marched noisily to the Cancellaria. A deputation waited on the Chambers, which appointed a representative committee to accompany the demonstrators. Prince Corsini, Galletti and the veteran Armellini were chosen to present the Club's ultimatum to the Pope. Armellini, who was seventy-five years old, and who had sworn loyalty to the Papacy six several times during his career in the Papal courts, owed his wealth and standing to the favor of the government. Galletti and he should have embraced. Pius IX. was forsaken, were it not for the ambassadors of Spain, France,

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 192-194.

² *La Rivoluzione Romana*, pp. 138-139.

Portugal, Bavaria and Russia, who remained at the Quirinal to support him in his trial. Minto, the agent of Palmerston and of the secret societies, was not with the Pope; nor was Pareto, the representative of Piedmont. The Pope did not receive the Club deputation, and, to gain time, suggested that Galletti undertake to form a new ministry. Pius would consider the names presented to him. The mob was waiting in the Piazza of the Quirinal. Galletti, coming out of the palace, announced the Pope's message, which was received with cries of protest and derision. The demands of the "people" must be granted immediately. Back to the Pope Galletti was sent. Pius was not to be moved. It was his right to select the ministers, he said, and to do this freely. Forced he would not be.

Receiving this answer, the Club proceeded to take the next step agreed upon. Barricades were constructed in the streets leading to the Quirinal. The Piazza was filled with armed men. Cannons were brought out. Soon shots were fired. The Pope's guard was the enemy. The gates of the palace were first battered with stones. Then came the Prince of Canino, who trained a cannon, stamped with the name *San Pietro*,—of all names,—on the residence of St. Peter's successor. Palace, Pope and all the orderly priests in Rome Canino would gladly have blown to pieces. Entering the Duc d'Harcourt's on the evening of the 16th, after a patriotic day's work, the Bonapartist Prince gaily asked the company: "Have you seen the sky?" The heavens were red with the peculiar glow which accompanies the Northern Lights. "The purple of the Cardinals is flying upward," added Canino, cynically. Down in the street the rabble spread the word that a sign was given unto them; the soul of Rossi had been condemned to everlasting flames. Before Canino could have conceived his pretty witticism, he had seen red blood flow at the Quirinal and had watched the red flames as they rose above the palace doors. A Papal secretary was shot. Bullets were deliberately fired through the windows of the Pope's apartment. The Papal guard, attacked while trying to put out the conflagration, sent a volley into the ranks of the insurgents. More than one unfortunate fell.

At night, about nine o'clock, Pius called the foreign ambassadors, and said to them that, "rather than a single drop of blood should be shed in his cause, he would submit to everything that had been demanded."¹ He submitted to force, as he called the ambassadors to witness, and, therefore, he submitted under protest. Then he sent for Galletti, the smirking, faithless conspirator, and accepted his ministry. Galletti informed the Pope that the

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 233.

ruling powers had changed the personnel of the ministry within a few hours. They had chosen Rosmini to hold the portfolio of Public Instruction. A minister of Public Instruction! One should not laugh at the acts of these men. Playing a farce, they were always in dead earnest. It is the tragi-comedian that has made and still makes the people pay in blood and cash for their political instruction.

The founder of the Institute of Charity, it will be remembered, came to Rome on a self-appointed mission of the very first class. He had charged himself with "all that he judged necessary or useful for the prosperity of Italy and of the Church." The fiction of a diplomatic appointment on behalf of the Piedmontese monarchy, even the vanity of Rosmini could not keep alive longer than the 4th of October. And yet here he is in Rome, six weeks later. Why is he in Rome rather than at Stresa? Doubtless because of his conviction that he is the "one man," not only in North Italy, but indeed in the whole of Italy, who can right a crooked world. Rosmini knew that his patent Constitution would have fixed the Pope on the throne and that the Rosminian "Federation" would have pacified all the princes and peoples. But as the Papal advisers had been so short-sighted as to reject both his schemes, what could the good man do other than remain in Rome, and try, through the special graces vouchsafed to him, to save Pope and people from worse mistakes than had been made? Of Rosmini's loyalty to the Pope, honesty of purpose, good will, there can be no doubt; but he was not fitted, by nature or training, for practical politics. He could have written admirable parlor-essays on Civil Service Reform. The men with whom Pius IX. had to deal were too deep for the charitable, simple Abbate. Rosmini's biographer says that, before Rossi's murder, the Pope "must have discovered that the Rossi ministry could not stand, *for*, on October 16th, we find it noted in Rosmini's diary that Monsignor Stella, the Pope's Cameriere and Confessor, was sent by his Holiness to inform him that he intended to make him Secretary of State." Perhaps it is the loose arrangement of the pronouns in this quotation that gives it an oracular character. Certainly Pius IX. did not suggest Rosmini's name for any cabinet office, after Rossi's death. However, the biographer further informs us that, dining with the Pope, by invitation, in the Vatican Gardens, the Pope told Rosmini that he meant to create him Cardinal in the Consistory of December.¹ Rosmini did not decline the honor. Indeed he made every preparation to receive it in a dignified manner, purchasing carriages that would not be unbecoming to a real Cardi-

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 353, 354.

nal.¹ This unofficial "appointment," Pius IX. continued to reserve *in petto*; and we are not surprised. Rosmini did not interrupt the gratuitous admonition which he had long vouchsafed to Pius. December was near at hand. A Cardinal that was to be, might as well remain where the Cardinals customarily resided. Oddly enough, the revolutionary insurgents offer him the leadership of a ministry, not a mere Diary ministry but a live ministry. Why did Galletti, Mamiani, Sterbini and Canino choose the founder of the Institute of Charity as an agent? There were points on which he and they partly agreed. He desired a federation, so did they; he favored a war against Austria, and so did the revolutionaries. Rosmini might fairly be termed a liberal. He was not in any sense of the word, an intentional revolutionary. Not a few hours before the presentation of his name to the Pope, the insurgents had adopted several important measures. The Popular Club met, declared the country in danger, and appointed itself a Committee on Public Safety. All good citizens were notified that, hereafter, rules and regulations proceeding from the assassins' club should be accepted as "representing the true and absolute will of the people." The army officers as well as those of the Civic Guard acknowledged the club's authority, and so did Colonel Stuart, commander at St. Angelo. The Chambers were advised of the new régime, and requested to consult with the actual government. Sterbini lent a hand to Bonaparte at the Quirinal, and the Papal Guard had notice that if the "popular" demands were not quickly gratified, the Palace would be bombarded and every one within put to the sword.² At this juncture it was that Rosmini received the honor of a nomination to the Presidency of the Council, with the portfolio of Public Instruction. Desirous of knowing the Pope's will in the matter, the Abbate "sent to the Holy Father to know if it was his wish that Rosmini should accept this office, for he did not know whether he had been named by the Pope, or only included in the programme presented by the revolutionists." Pius left Rosmini quite free, answering: that "on the one hand he should be pleased if Rosmini accepted the charge, because he would have in him a bulwark; on the other hand, he did not know whether Rosmini would be able to resist his colleagues, or would rather be crushed by them."³ From this politely careful reply, the Abbate "understood that the Pope did not oblige him to accept," and promptly resigned. To the ministers he wrote, that, "since the Pope was not free, the nomina-

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. ii., p. 26.

² *La Rivoluzione*, pp. 143-154.

³ *The Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 355-357.

tions were unconstitutional, and therefore he refused absolutely to form part of the Ministry." The next day Rosmini left the city.

As soon as the Pope accepted Galletti's nominations, the mis-crèants in the Piazza ceased their preparations for an assault. Deliriously they shouted; "Long live Pius IX. *alone!* Brotherhood and Union!" Then they forced householders to illuminate their windows. Decent people passed another night of terror. The Popular Club discharged the Papal Guard and committed the Pope's person to the tender care of the Civic Guard. Pius IX. was a prisoner. Villains of every degree and nationality were at the back of Bonaparte, Sterbini, Galletti. The Cardinals were not safe. To preserve their lives, one by one they slipped out of the Holy City. Day after day the position of Pius IX. was rendered more and more painful. His power had been usurped. The Chambers did not communicate with him. The Club was the Government. Surrounded by spies and assassins, at the mercy of malefactors who preserved his life only because they hoped, by conveniently threatening it, to force him to consent to their socialistic schemes, there was only one way left to the Pope of saving his dignity, his rights, and the rights of the Church. Convinced by the arguments of the foreign ambassadors and by his own experience and reason, Pius determined to foil the conspirators. On the night of November 25th, clad as a simple priest, he escaped his guards, entered a four-wheeler, and was soon out of the city and on the road to the Neapolitan frontier.

When the Popular Club discovered that the prisoner had escaped, more than one of the leaders must have recalled the words spoken by the Pope on the 11th of February preceding: "If ever—and pray God it may not be—an attempt be made to do violence to my will, to force my rights from me, if ever I see myself abandoned by the men I have so loved and for whom I have done everything, I shall throw myself into the arms of Providence, and Providence will not fail me." Pius had thrown himself into the arms of Providence and Providence did not fail him. But the Ananiases! Though many of them lie now in the tomb, their heirs are still plying the diplomatic avocation. The Church, Providence has never failed, will never fail. Still no man has found out its ways. On the morning of the 25th Pius arrived at Gaeta. Every Pope, under all circumstances, has protected the Sovereign rights of the Papacy. Two days after reaching Gaeta, Pius IX. issued a public protest against the illegal acts of the revolutionaries. "Solemnly we protest that we have been oppressed by violence, and therefore we declare all the acts consequent on violence null and of no value, of no legal force." Acting as the Sovereign of the Roman States, he nominated a Commission

which, during his absence, should govern according to his instructions. And to the revolutionaries he spoke words of bitter truth and of charitable warning. "There is a class of perverse men," said Pius, "who, in the face of Europe, have covered themselves with the stains of ingratitude; worse still, they are marked with the blot which an angry God has impressed upon their souls; a God, who, sooner or later, executes the chastisements pronounced by the Church." A Pope at Gaeta is the Pope. God is always and everywhere. The Church is God's Church.

JOHN A. MOONEY.

EARLY CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM.

THE word *Symbol*, meaning literally, "that which is taken with," denotes, in its widest signification, an object by which through the sense of sight, some particular idea is suggested, awakened, and impressed upon the mind. When we pass in review the primitive monuments of Christianity, and especially the numerous remains taken from the Roman catacombs, we are immediately struck by the continual repetition of certain mysterious signs, characters, and, we might say, hieroglyphics, which are evidently meant to excite attention to some matter of faith or morals. This is early Christian sign-painting or symbolism. Sometimes, persons and events of the Old Testament are brought into relation with corresponding ones of the New Testament; sometimes, figures taken from the fables of paganism, such as Orpheus taming, by the sweetness of his music, the wild beasts that gathered around him; or Ulysses, turning a deaf ear to the melodious incantations of the Sirens, are ingeniously diverted to point a moral to the Christian observer; at other times, it is from pastoral life, or from that of the agriculturist and the fisherman, that the sacred symbol is taken. But the richest source of early Christian symbolism is found in a circumscribed circle of objects, whether real or chimerical, such as a bird, a fish, a dragon, the phoenix, the centaur, or a flower, a tree, an anchor, a crown. All these, and many more, now one of which the early Christian artist, who worked under strictly hieratic rules, was allowed to assume at pleasure, have been represented in a variety of ways upon the monuments of Christian antiquity, from the tomb of a pontiff-martyr to an insignificant

little brooch or lamp. Clement of Alexandria, writing of figures proper to be engraved upon a Christian's finger ring, says: "Let our signs be, a dove, or a fish, or a ship sailing before the wind, or a musical lyre such as Polycrates¹ used, or an anchor which was on the signet of Seleucus; and if one be a fisherman, let him remember the Apostle and children taken out of the water."

From this passage we legitimately infer that symbols were in common use among the Christians of the second century, and that—whatever their origin—a new and a religious sense was now attached to them. Indeed, we may affirm that the monuments of early Christian ages exhibit a vast system of symbolism, constituting a hidden or hieroglyphical language, capable of expressing by conventional signs the principal mysteries of religion. These symbolical images, especially those cut or moulded on lamps, rings, and other portable objects of domestic or personal use, were all so many tokens of recognition among the faithful; a motive for their use, besides the fostering of individual piety, being the veil of secrecy which Christians were then obliged to assume for their own safety and for the honor of holy things. Yet further, we would insist that this ingenious symbolism was deliberately contrived and intended as an easy and pious mode of instructing the young, the simple, the illiterate, the ignorant. It has been said, reproachfully, that the early Christians took their symbols, in great part, from the Jews, and through them from the Egyptians and other Orientals; and that paganism even furnished a constituent part of it. Granting this, to some extent, and principally for the sake of argument, we answer, that there would be nothing improper in such a course, because it is the intention with which a certain sign is employed, and the conventional meaning attached to it by those who employ it, which determines its sense. Surely, we need not go back to Moses, who, as the Scriptures tell us, "was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," or to the prophets, who spake in the rich imagery of the East, in order to find a sanction for the employment of symbolical language; for, our Blessed Lord himself constantly made use of allegorical speech and of symbolical figures. Let us remark here, that we write only of early Christian symbolism, of such, namely, which has been described by very ancient writers of the Church, or has been discovered on very ancient monuments, because it would be too vast a subject to include in one article that rich

¹ Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, was the patron of the lyric poet Anacreon. Seleucus, founder of the Græco-Syrian monarchy, was obliged to maintain a powerful navy to protect his long stretch of sea-coast. By "the Apostle" is meant Saint Peter, and allusion is made to the words addressed to him by our Lord after the miraculous draught of fishes: "From henceforth thou wilt catch men." (Luke v., 10.)

and wonderful class which may be called Gothic or mediæval symbolism, and which flourished on all sorts of monuments from the fall of the Roman empire to the revival of the arts in the fifteenth century. This, of course, is a very interesting branch of Christian symbolism, but should be treated under the Christian archæology of the Middle Ages, and begins with the very curious and often rudely illustrated treatise entitled *Physiologus* in Latin, and rendered by *Bestiare* in the magnificent "Mélanges d'Archéologie" of Cahier and Martin.

The symbols used by the early Christians either originated with them, or were borrowed from other sources and turned to a new and better meaning. Sometimes animals are found represented on the tombs of Christians, as a sort of *cauting* term (to use an expression of modern heraldry), by which the name of the deceased was indicated; thus a sow has been found on the tomb of a certain *Porcella*, an ass on that of *Onager*, a goat on that of *Capriola*. These names of lowly animals were sometimes assumed, and their figures ordered to be cut on their tombs out of a spirit of humility, as inscriptions testify. They were mostly, however, the names of slaves. Let us now descend to particulars, and indicate the principal symbols found upon ancient Christian monuments, and to which a uniform sense was always attached, so that any one of them was equally understood by the learned and the unlearned—by the Latin, the Greek, the Syrian, the Gaul, and the (converted) Barbarian.

The lamb is taken as a symbol, sometimes of Our Lord, and sometimes of a simple Christian or follower of our Lord. Since the special character of the Redeemer was that of Victim, the earliest and most numerous testimonies in the Sacred Scriptures speak of him under this figure. Thus, in Genesis, and in the prophecies of Isaias, and of Jeremias. St. John the Baptist alluded to Him under this figure; and the same figure is employed by St. Peter and St. John. This figurative manner of speech passed at once into the language of the Church, as is shown from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, and other ancient writers. In the first place, it recalled to the minds of the faithful the great truth that Our Saviour shed His blood on the Cross, without subjecting so sacred a subject to the ridicule of heathens, against which Christians were secretly warned by the Discipline of the Secret, called *Disciplina Arcani*. We may thus look upon the lamb taken as a symbol of Christ, to have been the Crucifix of the early Christians, and in following the various phases or manners of representation we see that gradually the figure melts away into the undisguised Cross.

The oldest manner of representing Christ under this symbol

was a lamb standing upon a hill or mountain, whence flowed four streams of water. It is frequently found upon the bottom of those gilded glass vases used in the *Agapæ* or Love Feasts of the early Christians, and upon their sarcophaguses or stone coffins. These, although a class of monuments comparatively more recent than the gilded vases, often show us, from the larger space the artist had to work upon, some interesting peculiarity, which serves to illustrate or to emphasize a collateral text of Scripture or a mystery of religion, as when, for instance, on a lamp discovered at Marseilles, two harts (deer) are seen refreshing themselves at the water that flows from underneath the feet of the lamb. Another class is that of the lamb bearing one or other pastoral attribute, as the milk-pail (*mulctra*), the crook (*pedum*), where we recognize unmistakably the Good Shepherd. The *Nimbus*, called in art the Halo or the Glory, is, in connection with figures of animals, exclusively used on the Lamb, as representing our Lord. In a number of ancient monuments, the lamb figures in such combinations as prove the intent of the artist, or rather of the Church instructing and directing the artist, to protest against some prevalent dogmatic error, as when after the outbreak of the Arian heresy, representations multiplied of our Lord in person, seated with the right hand uplifted in the attitude of teaching, and having a lamb at his feet, by which were symbolized the two natures: Uncreated, Eternal, Divine Wisdom—the *Logos*, or Word of God—and the Victim which could suffer and die to redeem mankind. But such a dogmatic intention, suggested by a passing error, is not the most usual one. The lamb was far oftener represented so as to keep before the eyes and impress on the minds of the faithful the sufferings of the Innocent One who died for them. Consequently, as little by little the Church developed the mystery of the Cross to the outward senses, the lamb is found with some indication of suffering, as when over the head of the lamb was shown the monogram of Christ, which was a disguised cross. In the sixth century we see the lamb supporting a cross-tipped staff—the *Crux Hastata*,—and sometimes we see the lamb reposing on a book, the mystical sealed Book of the Apocalypse. At a later period the lamb is “standing as it were slain” upon an altar, at the foot of a precious and ornamented cross—*Crux Gemmata*. Again in the same century streams of blood issued from the wounded limbs and opened side of the lamb. In some very ancient mosaics described by Ciampini, the precious Blood flowing from the side is received into a chalice, and from the foot of this and from the four feet of the lamb flow five streamlets, which again come together to form one river of life. In these most singular mosaics we see, doubtless, the first public expression of devotion to the Sacred Heart

and to the Five Wounds of Jesus, and we have also before our eyes a suggestion of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the Seven Sacraments. Finally, towards the decline of the sixth century, a lamb is depicted or represented attached to the cross at the place where soon the Man of Sorrows will appear in human form, and the modern Crucifix will be revealed. Nevertheless, it was still customary, up to the tenth century and long after a human figure hung on the cross, to represent a lamb either at its foot or on the reverse. From this period down through the Middle Ages, the symbols of lowliness and of suffering are abandoned, and the lamb is accompanied with those of victory and triumph, as when the lamb supports a cross-shaped banneret called Standard of the Resurrection, or is encircled by a golden zone, to represent the divine power of the Saviour, as described by the prophet Isaías, "And justice shall be the girdle of his loins." Another peculiar form of symbolism is when the lamb is shown armed with a cross, and repelling a serpent, who represents the Evil One, the whole representation being drawn from this passage of the Apocalypse: "These shall fight with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them." In some cases the lamb is armed with a lance instead of a cross, and it has been suggested that as this weapon was, even among the heathens, as in figures of Pallas, or Minerva, a symbol of Wisdom personified, it may have been taken by Christians to represent their Lord overcoming the guile of the serpent by the wisdom of God. Finally the latest representations of the lamb as a symbol of Christ the Redeemer occur in the magnificent mosaics of the eighth and ninth centuries. These are ordinarily set in what are technically called in basilican architecture Triumphal Arches, which is that part of ancient church edifices separating the nave from the transept. The lamb is here represented as in the vision of the Apocalypsc, resting upon a glorious throne, around which are four angels and seven candlesticks. At the corners of the arch are the four animals of Ezechiel, each with his book, and a little lower down the four and twenty elders stand, robed in white and holding crowns in their hands.

Coming now to consider the lamb as a symbol not of Christ but of Christians, we may quote the words of Northcote and Brownlowe in *Roma Sotteranea*: "It cannot be necessary to appeal to any authority beyond the discourses of our blessed Lord himself to justify us in saying that a lamb or sheep represented one of Christ's fold." As a symbol of Christians taken collectively, that is, as a symbol of the whole body of the faithful, it is frequently found on the fragments of gilded glass, on sepulchral stones, and later on mosaics. Here two lambs are represented issuing out

of two cities, and hastening towards another lamb standing on a mount. Sometimes these two cities have their names inscribed over them—Jerusalem, Bethlehem—and stand for the converts from Judaism and the converts from Gentilism. At other times, instead of the names of the cities, are found the indications: *Ecclesia ex Circumcisione*, the Church of the Circumcision, that is, Jerusalem; and *Ecclesia ex Gentibus*, the Church of the Gentiles, which is Bethlehem, because there, at the Epiphany or Manifestation, the Divine Infant—Incarnate God—was adored by the Wise Men or Magi. Here also we perceive an allusion to the fraternal union of these two antagonistic peoples in the love of the same Christ: "For He is our peace, who hath made both one," as St. Paul writes to the Ephesians. Sometimes the lamb is represented on early tombs and in ancient paintings, to signify the meekness, humility and innocence that should distinguish the followers of Christ. In this tropological sense the lamb is often found on early monuments, as witness those figures of females called *Orantes*, who, with outstretched arms (a disguised symbol of the cross), stand between two lambs—natural expressions of innocence—which is interpreted to mean that petitions and praises from pure hearts are acceptable to God, but that there can be no graces except through the virtue of the Cross. Sometimes, also, a lamb accompanied with the word *Innocens* or *Innocentissimus* indicates the tomb of some infant or child who has died soon after baptism. As a special symbol, also, of purity or freedom from the lusts of the flesh, the lamb is represented between two wolves, or other ferocious beasts. Two lambs, face to face, having a cross in the form of the Monogram, or a vase full of fruits or of ears of grain, indicate the tomb of husband and wife: in the former instance when they have been disappointed of issue; in the latter case when their union has been fruitful. The *Ram* is not to be confounded with the lamb or the sheep, but has a distinct rôle in Christian symbolism, founded on that passage of Genesis in which, after Abraham had given evidence of his faith and obedience, a ram caught by the horns in the briars was substituted for the sacrifice of Isaac. The ram is therefore a symbol of Jesus Christ, who substituted himself for sinners, and St. Prosper sees here a special image of our Lord crowned with thorns. At a later period in ancient Christian art the sacrificial idea is more particularly conveyed by two rams *affrontés* with a Cross between them, which was a common decoration of the capitals of columns in early churches. In a secondary sense, the ram, which defends the lambs from harm, is, says St. Ambrose, commenting on the Forty-third Psalm, a symbol of Christ overcoming the devil; and since the Christian has strength to resist the Evil One through Jesus Christ, the ram is found on monuments relating to

baptism, and on finger rings dating from the ages of persecution. Indeed, St. Ambrose tells us that we should, like rams, overturn our infernal foes, relying on the strength of Our Lord, of Whom the horn is a figure, as in the Forty-third Psalm, sixth verse: "Through Thee we will push down our enemies with the horn."

Since the Scriptures frequently employ the deer, stag, hart or hind to convey certain moral ideas, the early Christians represented this animal in their monuments with a symbolical intention. According to its several special qualities it was looked upon as a symbol of Our Lord by Saint Ambrose; of the Apostles by Saint Jerome; of preachers, doctors of truth, of the faithful in general, by Cassiodorus; of the saints by Origen; finally of penitents. For instance, one idea drawn from the timidity and swiftness of the deer, was that the Christian must fear and shun the moral dangers—proximate occasions of sin—that menace the soul. Certain symbols being for the first time introduced or having already been received, obtained a special interpretation on the appearance of particular errors; thus the flying hart was used at a certain period as a protest against the heretical severity of the Cataphrygians who taught that it was not lawful for a Christian to seek to escape from persecution, although our Lord said: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another." Tertullian adopted this error and seems indirectly to attest the use of the symbol: "I have known some of their pastors to be lions in times of peace and deer in times of persecution."

Saint Ambrose adopts the deer as a symbol of virgins, applying it especially to Saint Thecla, the first of her sex who suffered martyrdom and defeated the dragon, as the deer drawing its slender feet together leaps upon and kills the venomous coiled serpent. The deer was also regarded by the early Christians as a symbol of mutual assistance, from the alleged fact of natural history that in crossing wide and rapid streams the deer enter the water in a long strong line, each one, except the leader, resting his head upon the flanks of the one before him; and that when the leader is exhausted he falls to the rear to find a support, and thus all cross over in safety. As a symbol the deer has been found in the oldest catacombs, on extremely ancient lamps, on very early tombs and in mosaics. It was particularly associated with baptism, from the touching words of the psalmist: "As the hart panteth after the fountains of waters, so my soul panteth after thee, O God." Thus in a painting discovered in the subterranean cemetery of *San Ponziano*, which goes back to the seventh century, a deer fixes his gaze upon the river Jordan with an expression of intense longing after its refreshing waters. The Horse, either standing still or in motion, and sometimes decorated

with a palm attached like a waving plume to the side of his head is frequently observed on early Christian monuments. Antiquarians have thought that, when without any other adjunct, it was taken as a symbol suggested by Saint Paul's epistle, in which human life is likened to a race; and when the palm is attached, as a graceful ornament to the head, it is the symbol of a swift martyrdom.

Although the Hare is often found on sepulchral slabs, earthenware lamps and precious stones, its exact symbolical meaning is not clear; but from the study of other things found in connection with it, it has been supposed to convey the same idea as the horse. Perhaps the smaller and more delicate of these animals was considered more appropriate for the tombs of and the articles used by women and children; either animal symbolizing the Christian's race to reach the gaol, as in the words of Saint Paul: "So run that you may obtain." In confirmation of this common idea, the horse and the hare are sometimes represented as running side by side. Twice on the tombs of children the hare is represented nibbling at a cluster of grapes; and it has been suggested that this harmless little creature symbolized the innocent soul of the child enjoying the pleasures of Paradise which was represented in Christian allegorical and figurative paintings and bas-reliefs as a garden of delight; although even here the primary idea of running in the race so as to obtain is obviously kept in view. From the fact that the hare is so frequently found on Christian lamps there must have been some special meaning attached to it in this connection; and it has been suggested that if, on the one hand, there is in this domestic utensil the idea of *watching* (which at once recalls our Lord's parable of the wise and foolish virgins) on the other we must see in this alert and nimble little animal which was said to sleep with one eye open, a symbol of *vigilance* and of promptness to answer, and run forward to meet the bridegroom.

Again the *hare* pursued by the *hound* was sometimes used,—cameos and intaglios with this subject upon them of early Christian possession having been discovered,—to signify the pagan persecutions; whereas the juxtaposition of a *ram* and a *hare*, such as is sometimes found on the bas-reliefs of ancient baptismal fonts, is supposed to signify that, in the battle of life, the conflict between grace and nature, to which (concupiscence surviving, after baptism) the neophyte was subject, some temptations are to be boldly met—yea, in the laudable exercise of Christian perfection, may even be voluntarily approached—but that others are to be shunned and fled from, which recalls the epigrammatic saying of that master of the spirit, St. Philip Neri, that in temptations of the flesh cowards are conquerors.

The Lion was taken by the ancients as a symbol of strength and

watchfulness, this quality being attributed to him because he was supposed to sleep with both eyes open—for which story Pliny's Natural History is probably responsible. Solomon, after King David's instruction, made lions of silver and gold for the temple at Jerusalem; but, perhaps,—from the more general idea connected with this king of beasts, of royal pomp and of fierceness, so opposed to the lives of those early and fervent disciples of Him who said: "Learn of Me, because I am meek and humble of heart,"—this figure is very seldom found on primitive Christian monuments. In mediæval archæology, however, the lion is a very common symbol, being constantly found at church porches, on episcopal chairs, on the *ambones* or pulpits whence the Scriptures were read, and on the candlesticks, and especially the paschal candlesticks, which were usually of immense size and of great beauty of design and material in bronze or marble or incrustated stone work. Travellers in Europe must have seen at the porches of some very old churches two lions—one on either side of the entrance—of whom one is represented playfully holding a child in its paws, whereas the other is angrily tearing a porcupine or other "small deer" with its fangs; in the first is symbolized the tenderness of pastors towards those young in the faith; in the second the avenging hand of pastors on contumacious and scandalous sinners, hence the *porcupine*, which was not supposed to keep its wickedness to itself as some other nasty animals do, but to be aggressive and discharge its fretful quills at passers by.

The Calf is often represented on the capitals of columns, particularly in very ancient churches. It was a symbol of Jesus Christ under the sacrificial idea of *Priest* and *Victim*, hence it accompanies the figure of Saint Luke the Evangelist, and of Christians as typifying guilelessness, and seems to have been suggested, in this sense, by the text of Saint Peter, in the Introit of the Mass for Quasimodo or Low Sunday: "As new-born babes desire rational milk without guile." It is mentioned by both Clement of Alexandria and Saint Ambrose.

The Serpent was taken by the early Christians as a symbol in three different senses. First, in sign of the victory of our Lord over the ancient dragon, in which sense it is not anterior to the reign of Constantine the Great. The serpent is thenceforward represented on gems and other small objects, coiled at the foot of the Monogram of Christ (which, as we have remarked, was a disguised form of the Cross), and later at the foot of the cross itself, expressing in the words of the Preface of the Passion: "That life might arise from that which produced death, and that he who conquered by wood, by wood also might be overcome;" a plain allusion to the serpent in the garden tempting Eve.

The once well-nigh universal tree and serpent worship, sprang from a perverted tradition of the Fall of man. Hence the serpent was in a particular manner the outward sign and symbol of idolatry; and although used in this sense with prudence and moderation at first (for the decisive overthrow of idolatry took place in the Roman empire only long after the triumph of the first Christian emperor); it was carried at a later period—as in the public and annual processions of the greater litanies, in a group with the cross—to represent death, and a paschal banner, to represent the resurrection. Secondly, a serpent was used by the early Christians, instructed in the word of our Lord: “Be ye therefore wise as serpents,” as a symbol of that cardinal virtue of prudence, without which, as Saint Bernard says, every other virtue would become a vice; and as this virtue is the fundamental one of good government, bishops were represented framed, as it were, within the encircled figure of a serpent, just as in the middle ages a serpent often formed the volute or curve of a prelate’s pastoral staff. Thirdly, the serpent was a symbol of the cross itself—by a sort of antithetical or associated or suggestive idea taken from the words of our Lord: “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” Its use in this sense was not long retained on account of the errors of the Ophites—or Serpent Worshipers—the Nicolaites, Gnostics and Manichees; and the numerous talismans, amulets and other minute objects on which this reptile figures are the remains of the followers of Basilides. Among the faithful the serpent was sometimes used as a symbol of the resurrection and of immortality, the habit of changing or sloughing its skin and of emerging from a mean state into a brighter and better one, easily explaining the reason. On the monuments of Egypt a serpent holding its tail in its mouth, thus forming a circle, was the sign of unbroken time or eternity.

Birds, real or chimerical, were frequently represented in painting, sculpture, mosaic, embroidery and on a great variety of early Christian monuments; generally, however, as mere ornaments. Sometimes, though, it is impossible—especially when we connect the representation with certain passages of Scripture or the Fathers—not to recognize a symbolical intention in lieu of an ornamental design. Thus the numerous representations in ancient Christian art—far down in the catacombs—of little birds disporting themselves amidst flowers and fruits are unmistakably a symbol of the souls of the faithful escaped from the trials and temptations of this world and now enjoying the delights of paradise; and we can cite here the figurative words of the Psalmist: “Our soul hath been delivered as a sparrow out of the snare of the fowlers. The

snare is broken and we are delivered." This symbolical interpretation is confirmed by the fact which has been verified that on slabs closing the subterranean graves of the dead the number of birds represented—painted, scratched or insculptured thereon—always corresponds exactly to the number of persons buried therein; one soul to each individual; one bird which represents in a material form that spiritual substance of each which springs from this world into the next to join the heavenly choir.

Birds confined in cages, representations of which have been found on paintings, bas-reliefs and gilded vases, are supposed to have symbolized the human soul within the prison of this material body, and also the confessors of the faith and the martyrs confined and tortured by their cruel captors.

Few early Christian monuments show us the eagle, although it was a common symbol in mediæval archæology. There can be no doubt, however, from the words of Saints Ambrose and Maximus of Turin and of other ancient Fathers commenting especially upon this verse of the 102d Psalm: "Thy youth shall be renewed like the eagle's," that this bird was used as a symbol sometimes of the resurrection of the dead, and at other times of the renewal of the life of grace in the soul dead to sin. Thus Saint Maximus of Turin takes the eagle which periodically moults its feathers as a symbol of the neophyte whose life is renewed in baptism. In heaven both body and soul will be renewed by glory, as here below the soul only is by grace renewed; hence in a very ancient painting in the subterranean cemetery of Priscilla *two* eagles are represented together upon the same globe.

The Cock figures very frequently upon early Christian remains, but especially on the tombs of the dead. It was taken as a symbol of the resurrection or awakening to a new life after the darkness of this world, because it is chanticleer's shrill clarion that announces the dawn of day. On sepulchral slabs this bird is represented in connection with certain formulas which leave no doubt of a symbolical intention. *In pace; Bene resurges; Surgatis pariter beati*, this on the *Titulus* of a husband and wife. It was also a symbol of vigilance. Hence when the Christians began to multiply churches above ground, the cock was often placed on the summit of the building to represent the vigilance of pastors turning alternately in every direction. It is especially taken by Saints Eucher and Gregory the Great as a symbol of preachers who announce amidst the darkness of error the truth which came from Him who is the true light of the world, and they quote the words of Job: "Who gave the cock understanding?" As a symbol of watchfulness and intelligence this bird belongs especially to the archæology of the middle ages. On some very

old sepulchral slabs two cocks are represented with lowered heads in the attitude of fighting; and it is supposed that they were then a symbol of tenacious courage and used to signify that those there buried had fought the good fight against the world, the flesh and the devil. This interpretation is rendered certain when a palm branch, as is sometimes the case, is associated with them. The Peacock, which, as Pliny observes, renews its elegant tail feathers with the spring, and the mythical Phoenix which was fabled to rise again from its own ashes, are found occasionally on ancient Christian monuments, and were unmistakably symbols of the resurrection; and the latter bird is so often found in connection with Saint Paul that it cannot be a mere accident, coincidence or ornament, but a symbolical tribute to that Apostle who in his Epistles and in the Acts spoke so eloquently of this consoling doctrine.

There is no other symbol except—as we shall see further on—that of the Fish, which is so frequently used by the early Christians, as that of the Dove. It appears on every species of monument, mural painting, mosaics, sepulchral slabs, lamps, candelabra, cameos, rings, brooches, and ornamented or gilded glass. We know how the dove figures in the Sacred Scriptures. Ancient baptistries were decorated with the figure of a dove—sometimes of solid gold—suspended from the ceiling, so that, with wings expanded, when gently swayed by the wind, it seemed to brood over the sacred font; as in Genesis, “And the spirit of God moved over the waters.” Our Lord, himself, proposed the dove to us as a symbol of simplicity; and the early Christians took it, besides, as an emblem of chastity, humility, meekness, and innocence in general. Sometimes, but rarely, the dove was intended as a symbol of our Lord, for the Greek word for this bird gives, if considered numerically—that is, taking the numerical value attached by the Greeks to each letter—the same sum that Alpha and Omega do; also, these two letters are never applied to any one else but to Him; and, if this sounds a little fanciful, the discovery in the very ancient catacomb of St. Catherine at Chiusi, in Italy, of a dove holding an olive slip in its beak and having a cross over its head, puts the symbol in a more certain light, and expresses the meaning of St. Paul to the Colossians, “Pacifying by the blood of the Cross the things which are on earth or in heaven.” The dove was also a symbol of the Christian soul; and a very ancient seal not only attests this, but indirectly, also, attests the sacred character of the Canticle of Canticles, which would not have been commonly read by the faithful, much less would its words have been used in a spiritual sense, were it reckoned among the *apocrypha*. On this seal a dove is represented with these words beautifully engraved around it, “*Veni si amas,*” “Come, if

thou lovest," which expresses, in almost identical words, the appeal of the Divine Spouse to the devout soul, "Arise, my dove, and come." (ii., 10.)

The Fish is very often mentioned by the Holy Fathers, and other early Christian writers, and is found innumerable times on ancient Christian monuments. It was a symbol, first, of our Lord, and secondly, of his followers. How, when, and by whom the happy idea was struck out that the Greek for fish, ἰχθύς, was a symbolical word of the greatest importance in the Christian sense, is unknown, although there is some reason for believing that it was discovered at Alexandria, celebrated from the very beginning for the number and intelligence of the faithful, and was first suggested by the initial letters of certain Sybilline verses. Observe, that this word represents the sum of Christian theology concerning our Lord: His name, His two-fold nature, His place among the Divine Persons of the Trinity, His priesthood, His redeemership: Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Θεοῦ, Υἱός, Σωτήρ—Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour.

We cannot do better than quote the words of Northcote and Brownlow, in the second volume of "Roma Sotterranea," page 73, particularly as this figure is of the greatest importance in Christian symbolism, which some might be inclined to think was more imaginary than real, and, perhaps, even quite fanciful and arbitrary. Speaking of a recently-discovered painting in an ancient Christian cemetery, at Alexandria, in which is represented, precisely over the altar where the holy mysteries were celebrated, a banquet of our Lord and Apostles, in which figures a plate with two fishes and several baskets of bread; and, at a little distance, the miracle of Cana; and again, in another compartment, a number of persons seated at a feast, with this legend over their heads, "Eating the benedictions of Christ"; the whole undoubtedly representing the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—the Holy Eucharist,—they say that the Christian artist "Has furnished us with a most precious monument, proving the identity, not only of Christian doctrine, but even of Christian artistic symbolism, both in the East and the West. We have shown the same truth elsewhere, by an appeal to epitaphs; we have shown that the same doctrines were expressed by the same forms in Rome and Alexandria, in France, in Egypt, and in Phrygia. Every baptized Christian understood them, whether he lived on the banks of the Tiber or of the Po, of the Loire, the Euphrates, or the Nile. In all these parts of the world, writers in books, poets in hymns, preachers in sermons, artists in painting, the very masons themselves on the tombstones made use of the fish in this symbolical sense, without a word of explanation. It is evident that, however unmeaning the figure

may have been to pagan eyes, or however strange it may seem to our own who are no longer familiar with it, it was as perfectly intelligible to contemporary Christians as the hieroglyphics of ancient Egypt to those who used them, or the letters of the English alphabet to Englishmen."

The Dolphin, which is noted for its velocity, and this world being often likened to a sea, was an early symbol of the intense desire and indefatigable advance of the Christian towards another and better world. It figures, in large dimensions, on sepulchral slabs and tombs, and more minutely on finger-rings and slighter ornaments, when it is usually represented twined about an anchor. The anchor being a symbol of hope, and the Christian's only hope being in the Cross of Christ, and being, also, a disguised form of the Cross, this constant union of dolphin and anchor on small articles worn about the person seems like a symbolical rendering of this verse of the Psalmist, "It is good for me to *adhere* to my God, to put my *hope* in the Lord God."

Trees of different species have been frequently found represented on ancient Christian monuments. The great archæologists, Aringhi, Lupi, Boldetti, Buonarotti and others, struck by the frequent repetition of this symbol, have studied its signification with much care. The tree, then, is first a symbol of Jesus Christ, who is the Tree of Life. In this sense Origen takes it in his commentary on this passage of St. Paul to the Romans: "If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, in like manner we shall be of His resurrection." Secondly, the tree is a symbol of man. In this sense it is taken by St. Jerome and Fulgentius, because his works are either good or bad, as the tree bears either good or bad fruit; and the former particularly finds himself on the figurative speech of our Lord in the seventh chapter of St. Matthew. Thirdly, trees decked in their foliage are a symbol of Paradise, the beauty of which is ever green and refreshes the saints. In this sense they figure in many mosaics and on many sculptured stones, and even in the diminutive glass cups or vases. The intercessory power of the Saints now reigning with Christ in glory, is shown in connection with this symbol in a very ancient picture of the virgin martyr Agnes, standing amidst umbrageous trees in the attitude of prayer. In this connection of trees in foliage representing symbolically the place of peace and repose, it is nearly thirty years ago, that, while studying at Rome this particular branch of early Christian Antiquities, we were touched by the exquisite appropriateness of those last delirious words of a famous God-fearing general: "Let us cross over the river and rest in the shade of the trees."¹ On tombs and sepulchral slabs we

¹ Stonewall Jackson.

sometimes remark a singular juxtaposition of trees, two being represented, one bare and the other covered with leaves. It has been interpreted to signify man's nakedness of good works—supernatural works—before baptism, and of his being clothed with righteousness after baptism. This seems to be the correct meaning, because two such trees figure one on either side of a neophyte who is receiving this sacrament. It may also be, as has been suggested, that these two trees thus opposed to each other were meant to symbolize the emptiness and vanity of this life and the fullness and joy of the life to come. The tree on sepulchres is often—especially when the kind represented is deciduous—a symbol of the change, the resurrection, the new life. The palm was used even by the heathens as an emblem of victory, and was adopted in the same general sense into the body of Christian symbolism. On tombs and sepulchral slabs the palm is generally accompanied by the monogram of Christ, to show that no self-conquest is possible except by virtue of the cross. The palm is next a general symbol of martyrdom. It does not, however, of itself alone present indubitable proof, when found on a sepulchral slab or tomb, that the deceased was a martyr; but taken cumulatively with representations of some instrument of torture, or on tombs in which the remains of linens once dipped in blood are found, or to which, imbedded in the now hardened mortar, phials which have contained blood have been attached, the palm is a most sure indication of martyrdom. The Scriptures contain, in many places, allegorical passages in which the vine figures, but leaving these and the writings of the Fathers, in which sometimes Christ and His Church, that covers the whole earth as this plant puts out its branches in every direction, is likened to the vine; it is remarkable, how often the vine, with its tendrils and its fruit, is represented in the mural paintings and on the bas-reliefs of the catacombs. Over and above any mere decorative design, we must see in this frequent repetition a determined purpose to keep before the minds of the faithful, in their confined and subterranean chambers, to which they were driven by unjust persecution, thoughts of a happy future, thoughts of Heaven. This view of a symbolical intention is confirmed by seeing little birds, and especially doves,—figures of souls released from the body—flying about amidst the trellis work, resting on vine branches, and pecking at clusters of grapes. Very often a single bunch of grapes is carefully represented on sepulchral slabs and on gilded glass used in eucharistic feasts. Now it is well known that the same symbol was used by the Jews of old to betoken the Promised Land, and there is no doubt that the early Christians, many of whom in Rome itself were converts from Judaism, retained the same symbol, but trans-

lated it from its more immediate and temporal sense to the remoter and eternal one, for, as St. Paul says, all these things happened to the Jews in figure. The Church having always used the word *Paradise*, which means, in Greek, a garden, to designate the abode of the just, Christian artists were naturally induced to decorate with flowers of various sorts the tombs of martyrs and the chambers of the catacombs in which those mysteries were dispensed which prepare man for Heaven.

Very often shells and conchs have been discovered in early tombs or stuck on the outside into the mortar while still soft, just before closing, or are seen engraved upon the slab. The frequent repetition in different parts of the Christian world of the same thing, clearly points to a fixed purpose, and to one not affecting a local belief, hope or scene, but to some general belief. This is no other than the dogma of the Resurrection; the idea being that, of the living soul breaking through death from its narrow prison of the body—the shell of mortality—which yet retains a pledge of immortality in the Holy Viaticum, by which it is not left altogether without, at least, some semblance of a continued mysterious existence even in the tomb, as the shell whence the living mollusk has departed still gives forth, when held to the ear, a sweet, soul-stirring music, awakening keen emotions and strange yearnings after we know not what, and distant impressions from we know not whence. It has been observed that the species of shell almost always used by the Gauls was the *Helix pomatia* of our conchologists, which, when it retires within its cover at the approach of winter, has the faculty of closing the entrance by a peculiar kind of thin but impenetrable membrane called the epiphragm, which it bursts open to issue forth at the approach of spring. This hibernation was aptly chosen to symbolize the silence of the tomb, which will be broken when the dead shall rise again at the last day.

The sun and moon have been represented on early Christian monuments in connection with our Lord as the Eternal Pastor, these celestial figures having been used by the pagans for symbols of eternity. They are also often, but at a comparatively late period, seen in representations of the Crucifixion, because these heavenly luminaries suffered eclipse and mourned with the Author of Nature when He died. The Star is frequently used on ancient Christian monuments. In the first order of ideas it is a symbol of the divinity of Jesus Christ and of His supreme dominion over all things in heaven and on earth, hence our Lord is sometimes represented between two or more stars. In another order of ideas stars are a symbol of His Church, and then they are always just seven in number. When, therefore, this particular number is found upon Christian tombs, erected, as may be conjectured, during a period of

schism or at the prevalence of some heresy, it indubitably stands for a silent protestation that the deceased sleeps in the peace of the one true Church.

On a small number of Christian monuments the signs of the Zodiac are represented. Boldetti has delineated a beautiful ancient bracelet, on the inside and outside circles of which the twelve Signs are engraved. It has been plausibly conjectured that far from serving a superstitious use, in the manner of the heathens, who were given up to astrology, it was piously worn as a constant reminder of the instability of human events and the mutabilities of fortune, and that *we* go away but *they* remain; nor can we doubt that the words of Ecclesiastes were familiar to the wearer: "A generation passeth away and a generation cometh, but the earth standeth forever."

The four seasons have been symbolically represented along with the figure of the Good Shepherd. It is in this connection an emblem of Providence, which provides our daily food and leads us, the sheep, to proper pastures.

Marble eggs and sometimes the shells of real eggs, therein deposited before closing, have been found in early Christian tombs. They were symbols of the Resurrection.

A hand issuing out of a cloud was always a symbol of the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, God the Father, because the hand is naturally an emblem of work, and the making of all things out of nothing, the creative act, is theologically ascribed to the Father.

However paradoxical it may appear, we can assert that in this age almost the only survivor of the early and mediæval symbolism of the church, is found in that decried but little understood science of heraldry which was essentially religious in its origin and was entirely suggested by the clergy, who in those times when it arose, were alone competent to interpret and to parcel out to deserving individuals the perishing fragments of such a system. (See Lord Lindsay's "Sketches of Christian Art," II., 49.)

ROBERT SETON.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

No. 3. THE ACCOMPLISHMENT.

THE memorable morrow came, August 3d, 1492, which was destined to witness a sight quite ordinary in general appearance, yet in motive, aim, and results, unprecedented in history: a morrow, such as old Chaucer sang of in quaintest phrase:

But by the cause that they shulden rise
Early *a-morwe* for to seen the sight,

It was a Friday, a day made famous by the triumphs of Columbus, for it was on that day, also, that he discovered America. It was therefore most appropriate, what this Christian hero then announced, as Oviedo the historian informs us, that he sailed in the name of Jesus Christ. He fervently recalled the day of Christ's redemption of man. The hero of a new crusade, he remembered that on that day Godfrey de Bouillon, his precursor, delivered the Holy Sepulchre from the power of the Mahomedan, and on that day, a campaign in Spain, in which he had served himself as a crusader, Mahomedanism was conquered and driven from Europe. While the stars were yet shining, and half-way between midnight and dawn, at the convent of La Rabida, the prior of the convent offered the Holy Mass for a new intention, and the Admiral of the Ocean received the Holy Eucharist; might it not be his Viaticum?

The monk and the mariner descend the convent steps together; the port of Palos is soon reached; the watch guards had seen the lights of sacrifice shining through the convent windows and now the signals are given from the three caravels; the admiral receives the last blessing of the monk on the shore. He now stands on the deck of his flag-ship beneath the royal pennant; the inhabitants of Palos throng the shore; the sails receive the grateful breeze; the word of command is given, and Columbus, waving adieu to country, sons, friends and all the people on shore, announces that he sails in the name of his Saviour. No vessel had ever sailed due west through and across the Sea of Darkness before—but the prows are turned to the west—the Sea of Darkness lies before them,—the people exclaimed they can never return—such were the feelings of the people; the people of Palos, the fathers and mothers, the sisters and brothers, the friends and sweethearts, of the

doomed crew on the three caravels; such too was the feeling among the sailors of the crews—farewell to Spain forever!

“It were vain to speak, to weep, to sigh;
Oh! more than tears of blood can tell,
* * * * *
Are in the word, farewell—farewell.”

Sadness on shore and on deck was further supplemented by the anger and disloyalty of Gomez Rascon and Cristobal Quintero, the owners of the *Pinta*, which had been impressed, and who were sulking on the ship and amid the crew.

But there was one man on board, who stood on the deck of the flag-ship, full of courage, hope, faith, determination and firm resolve. He waved farewell to the monk of Rabida, to the people of Palos, and to Spain, with manly good will and loyalty, and then turned his face and his heart to the west. He entered on the opening page of his historic journal, that he commenced the voyage:

IN NOMINE DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI.

With appalling difficulties, trials, dangers and disloyalties immediately before him, Columbus was even now virtually the Discoverer of the New World.

The *Santa Maria* was a single-decked craft, ninety feet long, with twenty feet breadth of beam. Neither the *Pinta* nor the *Niña* were decked amidships. The whole expedition contained only ninety persons. The ships were such as might be employed on a yachting cruise up the East River and Long Island Sound. Columbus sailed a half hour before sunrise; south lay the course for forty-five geographic miles and then shifting a couple of points to starboard the little fleet stood for the Canaries, in order that they might thence sail due west on the 28th parallel, expecting thus to reach the northern end of Cipango, and thence to Zaiton (Chang-Chow) and other cities of China so graphically described by Marco Polo. Troubles now began to commingle with the Admiral's brightest hopes. The rudder of the *Pinta* became broken and unshipped, and the circumstances indicated that it was the foul work of her owners and crew. But immediately he saw the hand of Providence in the proximity of the Canaries, and here he stopped for repairs, the islands being then most appropriately known as the Fortunate Islands. Now again consternation was spread among the sailors by an eruption of Teneriffe in full view; and again by the rumors of Portuguese ships hovering near to capture Columbus and his fleet. Having again set sail, now due westward, on September 6th, on the 8th the last land of the eastern hemisphere, the shores

of Ferro, disappeared from sight, and the ships were plunging into the Dark Ocean, while many of the sailors violently lamented their fate and cried like children. In order to avoid threatened mutiny, the Admiral kept two reckonings of the distance run, a correct one for himself, a shorter one for the frightened crews. Columbus saw only, and blessed, the hand of Providence in the propitious weather. On September 13th, he observed and was startled by the deflection of the needle, thus creating new alarms, which his ready resources allayed, while he treasured the observations for the cause of science. Winsor, who could see nothing good in Columbus, or even in Isabella, admitted that this discovery marks a point in the history of navigation. On the 16th, he discovered the great oceanic region of sea weeds, Sargasso Sea, a vast extent of green resembling a boundless pasture six times larger than France. This discovery was important as it disclosed and located the regions provided by Providence for the generation and growth of sea-food. Fears of direful evil increased among the crews—all seemed weird and uncanny. If the ships escaped fatal entanglements, they would be foundered on hidden rocks, or swallowed by monsters. Soundings, however, did not reach bottom, for the water was over 2000 fathoms deep. On September 22d., the ships were again in the open sea, free from grass and weeds, but the winds all blew to the west (the Trade Winds), and the sailors were panic-struck at the thought of never having a contrary or west wind to carry them home again to Spain. The Admiral again blessed Providence for a change of the wind to the southwest, showing their capability for change and convincing the crews that the winds might yet carry them homeward. The crews next became impatient for land; he found it taxed all his immense resources to restrain them. On September 25th, a mirage disclosed to their deluded visions phantom hills (in Cipango) but the consequent joyous hymns of thanks soon died upon the waves, to be succeeded by mutterings of disappointment and sedition. The flight of birds now gave hopes, but these also sped away together in the sightless distance. Alternate hopes and fears, imaginations and disappointments, succeeded each other with every alternate sign of land. Surely the doomed ships and fated crews were immersed and plunging deeper in space, delusion, enchantment, deception and death. The mutiny of the crews rankled in the hearts of the sailors, and increased until the murder of the Admiral was even canvassed—the sea he had so eagerly sought would as eagerly receive and devour him, and it too would obliterate every trace of the guilt of the mutineers and murderers; how easy it would be to say “he had fallen overboard while gazing at the stars.” So far a superstitious faith in his superior knowledge had saved him.

When October 4th came, the admiral was in momentary fear of an outbreak—he alone knew of all on board the distance they had travelled from home; and on that very day he reported the reckoning of the day 138 miles when the true distance was 189. On the 7th the ships had traversed in all 2724 miles; the Admiral reported 2200; he had actually travelled 224 miles further than he had estimated the distance to Cipango. His pilots urged him to change his course to the southwest; they thought he had passed between and beyond the islands—he began to fear himself that he was sailing past Cipango. If flights of birds among ancient Greeks and Romans, determined, as sacred omens, the gravest affairs of State, of peace and war, so now the frequent appearance and flight of small birds, such as inhabit the shores, to the southwest, confirmed the impressions that land lay in that direction. Yielding to these signs and to the importunity of his pilots, he changed his course to the southwest. Was this change fortunate or unfortunate? Fortunate in this, that by the change he had only 505 miles to reach the goal, whereas by keeping on due west he had 720 miles, and an open revolt, and his own death may thus have been prevented. But unfortunate in this, that by the latter or west course he would have struck the coast of Florida, a little south of Cape Malabar, and the Continent at once would have been his; he would have founded an empire and erected a civilization within the limits of our own Republic. What might not have been the results of such a course upon our own destiny!

It has been generally believed, no doubt upon the unreliable authority of Oviedo, that Columbus, about this time, capitulated with his crews; and promised to turn his prow to the east and return to Spain, if land were not discovered in three days. This report is discredited and is now rejected by historians. Yet his conviction that land was near amounted to absolute faith. On the other hand the wildest excitement prevailed on board. Columbus with sublime composure observed every phenomenon of the heavens and the seas; every situation of the stars, every swell and sign of the waters. A new world of nature, and of nature's ways and products was faithfully and enthusiastically recorded in his journal. The signs of land at hand increased every moment. On October 11th, these signs became unmistakable. Mutiny was hushed in instant expectation and watching. In the middle of this frantic excitement, the thought of self and pelf possessed the minds of all, and all eyes were eagerly strained, each one hoping to win the reward of 10,000 maravedis promised to the one that first should see the land. The vigils and watches of the admiral had not ceased by day or by night. How could human nature hold out under such strain? How could he fail to be the first to see the land which he himself had promised?

On the sunset of the eleventh of October there was a slight reaction at the delay of the land in coming into view, and many false alarms and excitements had occurred. Washington Irving says that "Columbus considered himself under the immediate eye and guardianship of Heaven in this solemn enterprise." His vigils were incessant, interrupted not by sleep or rest, but only at regular intervals when he retired to recite the pious office of the Franciscans. Day and night he was at the poop, watching the helm, scanning the sea, the air, the stars, and mounting frequently to the top-mast. He noticed what seemed to him extraordinary changes in the face of nature. He scanned the horizon, tested with the keenest sense of smell the saline effluvias of the ocean to detect the possible odors of land, of vegetation, and of human or animal life. The winds were studied, the water tasted, the temperature of air and water observed, soundings of the water-depths were taken. Experiments were made on the forces and directions of the ocean's currents; he seized and examined every passing herb or blade of grass; a little lobster caught from the waves was minutely studied, for they never ventured far from coast, and from a school of tunnies one was harpooned and carefully examined on deck. Martin Alonso Pinzon had called out from his ship, the Pinta, "Land! Land! Señor, I am the first who saw it; declare my right to the pension," and the *Gloria in Excelsis* had more than once been chanted at the sight of a phantom shore. In the midst of the hourly excitement, Columbus was calm, intent on studying the physical phenomena of the new regions, while never for a moment relaxing his vigils at poop and helm. "The sea is always fine," he exclaimed, "be infinite thanks rendered to God." Martin Alonso Pinzon heretofore trustful in the genius and knowledge of Columbus had now failed in courage; he and his brothers joined in the revolt of the crews. The signs of land at the close of October 11th, had rekindled the hopes of all; the setting sun, however, had not revealed the land; surely it would be discovered before another sun went down.

When night had set in Columbus took his vigil as usual at the tower-like poop of the Santa Maria; his eyes were straining with more than wonted eagerness. When suddenly at 10 o'clock, he beheld a distant light apparently on the shore; it moved about, and up and down, as if carried in the hand of a human being running along the shore. He called a royal officer, named Pedro Gutierrez, who also saw it; others were called to see the joyous yet doubtful sight; the light disappeared and again returned to sight. While others doubted or denied, Columbus declared his belief that they had reached the land, and that it was inhabited. At midnight all was still, but the Admiral's assertion had electrified

all; the ships were kept near together, carried little sail, but the wind carried the fleet rapidly westward; the *Pinta* got far ahead of the other ships. Not an eye was closed on the three ships. Two hours more had passed in eager and unbearable suspense, and the watches cried two o'clock of October 12th, when suddenly like a bolt from Heaven, the sound of a gun on board the foremost ship, the *Pinta*, announced to all the sight of land. It had been seen first by a sailor named Rodrigo de Triana (Count de Lorgues gives his name as Juan Rodriguez Bermego.) Land was seen in the very direction in which Columbus had seen the light on shore. A shout of joy went from all; the sails were quickly lowered, the ships lay to, and the time before day was busily occupied by all on board the three ships in burnishing their arms and putting on their best attire. Columbus, with his usual prudence, put the flotilla in a state of defence. Who knew but that the fleets and armies of some great Asiatic potentate might be marshalled on hostile shores to annihilate them in the morning? The entire crew of the flagship, so lately open mutineers, now came forward in a body to do homage to the Admiral. The latter threw himself upon his knees and intoned the *TE DEUM LAUDAMUS*, and the whole of the crews joyously responded to the pæan.

On Friday, October 12, 1492, Columbus accompanied by the captains and officers, and some sailors, landed on the shores of an island, a part of the New World, and took possession in the name of the Saviour, and of Spain for Ferdinand and Isabella. The natives called the island Guanahani, Columbus named it San Salvador. Being the first to land, he fell upon his knees and kissed the earth three times. Columbus broke the choking and impressive silence of this momentous occasion with the following prayer, which, by order of the Spanish sovereigns was used by Cortez, Balboa, Pizarro, and other discoverers; "Lord! Eternal and Almighty God! who, by Thy sacred word, hast created the heavens, the earth, and the seas, may Thy name be blessed and glorified everywhere. May Thy Majesty be exalted, who hast deigned to permit that by thy humble servant, Thy sacred name should be made known and preached in this other part of the world."

Several islands claim the honor of having been the Indian Guanahani, the Spanish San Salvador, and amongst these are chiefly Cat Island, Samana or Atwood's Bay, and Watling's Island. The natives were perfectly naked; they were frightened beyond expression at this apparition, and fled to the woods. When, gradually drawn by the smiles and kindness of the Spaniards, they timidly approached, with awe and wonder, felt the beard, the persons and the weapons of the dread strangers, to see if they were real; they believed that they had descended from the skies.

When the Admiral cruised about, he found and visited four islands, and concluded that he was in the region of the ocean just east of Cathay. Upon learning that gold was to be found to the south, he sailed thither on October 25th, expecting to find Cipango, and thence to sail along the coast of China to Quinsay, and to deliver to the Grand Kahn the credentials he had received from Ferdinand and Isabella. He reached Cuba, supposing it to be a part of the Asiatic Continent, and sent a deputation to find a prince said to be at war with the Grand Kahn, hoping thus to gain tidings and visit the latter potentate. Neither Oriental potentates, nor cities, nor palaces, nor spices, nor gold was found; but something they did find, which was destined to affect the lives and fortunes, and health and happiness of the world's millions for all time, and to produce revenues greater than that of all the spices, gold, and treasures of the east—*Tobacco*. Disappointed and bewildered, he turned his prow to the southeast in quest of another great island abounding in gold. And now Martin Alonzo Pinzon deserted his post, and his chief—he hoped no doubt, to visit rich islands first with his fleet ship and return to Spain, before the Admiral, and claim the discovery.

Having sailed eastward to the end of Cuba, Columbus supposed it was the end of Asia, and then he discovered Hayti, where he landed and called it Hispaniola. Here again he searched for the rich region of Cipango, which still eluded his search. On Christmas day the flagship, the Santa Maria, was wrecked, and all was transferred, crew, armament, and provisions to the Niña, now his only ship. Alas! he thought, should this little vessel go under, the world would not know that Columbus had discovered a world, and Martin Alonzo Pinzon, the deserter, would claim the honor and fruits of the discovery. This thought brought him at once to the decision of returning to Spain. He had found a devoted friend in Guacanagari, a native chief of that part of Hayti, where he landed. A fort was constructed of the wrecked ship's timbers, armed with her guns, and called *La Navidad*, in honor of the Christmas festival. Such was the beauty of the island, its fruits and climate, such the friendship of the neighboring cacique, such the indolence, the comfort and self-indulgence which had followed the speedy alliances formed by the Spaniards with the Indians, that many begged to be chosen among the garrison, which the Admiral would leave at La Navidad, while he returned to Spain. It seemed but a necessity, an obvious policy, that Columbus should found in the New World a colony, to continue the immediate possession, the evidences of the discovery, and form a living link between Spain and Hispaniola, between the Old and the New Worlds. With such a fort, armament, and garrison, with

Spanish superiority over native savages, and with the friendship of Guacanagari and his subjects, the forty men left behind under the command of Diego Arana, were perfectly safe against every possible hostile act of the natives. But would they be safe against their own vices and crimes?

On Friday, January 4, 1493, Columbus sailed in the *Niña* on his return voyage to Spain, having admonished the garrison of La Navidad in terms well calculated to be remembered by them and faithfully observed for their own safety. Columbus sailed along the northern coast of Hispaniola, and after two days he encountered Pinzon, the deserter, on the *Pinta*, who endeavored to excuse his treachery by pretexts based on his being delayed in trading with the natives, by his search for gold and being separated by storms. Columbus prudently concealed his indignation, and the *Pinta* and *Niña* sailed homeward in concert. He compelled Pinzon to restore to liberty five Indian men and two girls whom he had seized and was carrying to Spain to make them slaves. On January 10th occurred the first hostile encounter between the Indians and the Spaniards. The voyage was replete with hardships, dangers, escapes of every kind. A barrel, containing an account of his discovery, sealed up in a jar, was cast overboard, and another kept on deck, so as to announce by chance the result in case of shipwreck. The vessels were again separated, Columbus was finally driven ashore by a storm in Portugal, was received with honors at that treacherous court, and finally arrived at Palos on March 15th. Later on the same day the *Pinta* with Pinzon on board entered the same port; the false captain had endeavored to claim the discovery and had sent messengers to court; but when he found Columbus had arrived just a few hours before him, and the court spurned his treacherous approaches, he slinked ashore, hid himself and not long afterwards died from chagrin and mortification. Columbus was received at court in the city of Barcelona with such honors from the king, queen, nobility and people as never before or since have greeted hero, conqueror or discoverer. The interest felt in the specimens he brought from the new world was intense, for he exhibited in his triumphal progress and at court stuffed birds and animals, live parrots, some pearls, gold and other minerals, plants and various articles, but above all six Indians, survivors of the ten he sailed with, natives of the West, all painted and dressed in their native style. It is impossible to describe the scenes, the honors, the impressions, the rejoicings, the results of this unparalleled event. All historians concur in the testimony that Columbus bore himself amid these dazzling events and scenes with such dignity, modesty, intelligence and manliness as to win universal admiration. In addition to unprecedented

honors at court, Columbus received the most distinguished honors and fêtes from the nobility. I might here relate the story of his making the egg stand on end, but I can only refer to it to discard the story; though of no importance it still has no historic support.

It was easy for him now to obtain from the crown another fleet, and from the people ample volunteers for a second voyage. Numerous applications had to be rejected. The details of his four voyages have to be condensed in a single article. All who embarked felt sure they were sailing for the most opulent parts of Asia, and that unbounded wealth awaited them. All ranks of society now sought to embark, from the common sailor to the most noted and distinguished members of the nobility and chieftains distinguished in the Moorish war. Among the many eminent names I will mention only the already celebrated prior of the convent of La Rabida, Juan Perez de Marchena, Juan Ponce de Leon, afterwards famous as the discoverer of Florida, and the father and uncle of the good and great Las Casas, who afterward became the apostle and the liberator of the Indians. The expedition sailed from Cadiz on September 25, 1493, and amongst the many eager and enthusiastic persons of all grades and conditions, who witnessed the grand and notable event, were the two sons of Columbus, Diego and Fernando, the younger being then only five years of age. The expedition consisted of fourteen caravels and three larger store-ships called carracks, and they carried out many things never seen before in America, horses, mules, cattle, European cereals, vines, sugar cane, and indeed everything needed for a permanent colony. The crown had established a Bureau of the Indies, and over it was placed, in accordance with the then prevailing custom of that age and country, an ecclesiastic, who by accepting such an appointment must have utterly abandoned all care of souls and all zeal for religion. This was Juan Rodriguez de Fonseca, then archdeacon of Seville; for thirty years he exercised with immense power the direction of the affairs of the Spanish new world, and was noted for his executive ability and his untiring energy in the secular, pecuniary and commissary affairs confided to him. For his services in such worldly pursuits he received from the crown the bishoprics of Badajoz, Cordova, Palencia and Condè, and the archbishopric of Rosano in Italy together with the bishopric of Burgos. In the midst of his worldly and business functions it must be doubtful whether he had time ever to enter the territories of some of his dioceses. He was also principal chaplain to Ferdinand, and afterwards to Isabella. With so many offices his emoluments must have been immense. Columbus, and subsequent discoverers, suffered under his animosity, and Fonseca's concentrated hatred was equal to that of as many officials as he

himself bore titles and offices. Columbus soon fell under his dislike, and suffered untold wrongs and injustices at his hands.

There was made provision now also for the spiritual needs of the natives and of the Spaniards, for the lessons of history that followed teach that the latter greatly needed such forethought of the Holy See and of the crown. An ecclesiastical and missionary organization was formed, a Vicariate Apostolic of the Indies, and Father Boil, a native of Catalonia and a Benedictine monk of Montserrat, was appointed superior of the mission, or Vicar-Apostolic, and the mission embraced several religious co-laborers. Father Boil was a favorite of Ferdinand, and long attendance on court had interested him in secular and diplomatic concerns. Such was the compact organization of Europe and of the Church in Europe, such the isolation of pagan lands, that the missionary spirit had not as yet been developed among the clergy of the fifteenth century as was so splendidly exhibited afterwards in the sixteenth century with St. Francis Xavier and his brethren, and subsequently when Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans and other Religious Orders sought to evangelize the Indians in North and South America. Father Boil was not a volunteer. But when appointed he obeyed the call. Such was his feeling of fairness and admiration for the Admiral at this time that when Soria, the Comptroller-General of the Indians, and a follower of Fonseca, with the connivance of the latter, heaped outrages upon Columbus, Father Boil wrote to Queen Isabella and had his wrongs redressed. These details, the hostile Fonseca, and Soria in Spain, Vicar-Apostolic Boil in Hispaniola, who did not seek his mission but accepted the office offered him, and a colony greatly composed of a proud and punctilious nobility, show in advance the difficult task assigned to the Admiral in the administration of Hispaniola. Add to this the peculiar circumstances of the Indians, the greater part in numbers, yet the weakest and most untried part of his vice-regal subjects. Yet under such unprecedented circumstances Mr. Irving recognizes in his administration the most consummate wisdom and action. The members of the expedition were limited to 1200, but such was the eagerness to embark that the actual number embarked was 1500, and great numbers were turned away. Diego Columbus, the admiral's youngest brother, came from Genoa, on the announcement of his great discovery in 1492, and joined the second expedition. On October 7th the fleet weighed anchor for the Canaries; the course was west and slightly south.

On November 3d the islands of the New World were again sighted, and calling the first island Dominica, in honor of the Lord's Day, Columbus cruised among the Caribbean or Cannibal Islands; such was the ferocity of their inhabitants, that their very name of Can-

nibal has now become the name of man-eaters generally. Arriving at La Navidad on November 27th, the Admiral, to his consternation and grief, found the fortress demolished and the garrison murdered. It was a still greater grief to learn on investigation that it was the passions, the lusts, disobedience to superiors, and general misconduct of most of the men, that led to this catastrophe. The Indians found the white men not celestial, but excessively human. The principal events of this second expedition were the founding of the city of Isabella, afterwards superseded by that of San Domingo, the exploration of Cibao, which was found not to be the golden Cipango of Marco Polo, the exploration of the coast of Cuba, the discovery of Jamaica, and the erroneous impressions that they were on the Asiatic coast was as erroneously, yet unanimously confirmed, in the minds of all. The long and excessive fatigues of the Admiral, both of mind and body, threw him into a profound lethargy, and on his coming out of it he found his faithful brother Bartholomew, just arrived from Spain, at his side. Bartholomew Columbus had been sent by his brother from Spain to England in order to obtain the acceptance of his proposals from Henry VII., and from this Catholic king he had actually received favorable promises, and on his return through Paris, he there heard of his brother's great discovery, and received from the French king assistance on his homeward journey and tokens of distinguished regard. Columbus, who was still suffering from his late illness, welcomed his brother with joy, and appointed him Adelantado, or governor, and also clothed him with full power during his own convalescence.

Before going on his exploration, Columbus sent back to Spain Antonio de Torres, with twelve ships. The most important feature of this return voyage was the letter which Columbus addressed to the Spanish sovereigns, in which he set forth his views in relation to the future administration of the Vice-Regal Government of Hispaniola, the wisdom of which suggestions subsequent events proved—a proof, however, chiefly drawn from the disregard of the Admiral's recommendations. His suggestion that the Caribs, who constantly waged war on their inoffensive neighbors and reduced them to slavery, murdering the men and seizing their women for wives, and even making a practice of eating many of their human prisoners, should be sent to Spain and sold for slaves at the discretion of the sovereigns, was the only recommendation of the Admiral which they, after great deliberation and consultation, declined to approve. This subject will be considered in our last article on Columbus. But the approval of his suggestions generally did not ensure the means necessary to enable Columbus to carry them into effect.

The building of the new city of Isabella became the engrossing effort, and, in spite of the unhealthiness of the climate, the unwillingness of cavaliers to labor, and the machinations of the disaffected Spaniards, the Admiral saw presently built a neat little Spanish town, with church, market-place, public granary, dwelling-house, and a stone wall enclosing all. Having explored the interior of the island in person, and finished the exploration of the adjacent islands, he found on his recovery from his prolonged lethargy that many of the men whom he had trusted with the administration during his absence, proved unfaithful. Margarite, a royal officer, had been left in command of the open country, Ojeda of the fort, and his brother Diego was appointed governor of the colony, together with a council consisting of Father Boil and three leading men, Diego being president of the council. The Spanish noblemen in Hispaniola would submit to no restraints, but rioted in the land, tyrannizing over and murdering the natives, abusing the women, and slaying each other in private feuds. The gentle Cacique, Guacanagari, the Spaniards' friend, even suffered from them. Father Boil insisted upon condemning him and subjecting him to severest treatment. Margarite, a favorite of King Ferdinand, became the leader of a band of insurgents, and Father Boil, incensed at the Admiral's protection of Guacanagari, joined the disaffected. He knew little of the policy of mercy and gentleness, even towards the ignorant Indians. A plot to seize the five remaining ships and return to Spain was discovered by Columbus in time to seize the rebel leader in this design, Bernal Diaz, and send him to Spain for trial. In the meantime the poor natives, whose confidence had been abused by the Spaniards throughout the island, whose provisions had been seized, appropriated, and even wantonly wasted, whose homes had been invaded and plundered, their dearest domestic rights invaded, their country overrun with lawlessness, and themselves subjected to every insult and outrage, revolted against the Spanish authority. The chieftain, Caonabo, became the leader of the other tribes, and all confederated to overwhelm and exterminate the hated strangers. Columbus and his two brothers, Bartholomew and Diego, who had had no part in the ill-treatment of the natives, had now to meet this Indian uprising from without, while discontented and lawless Spaniards sought their destruction within. Guacanagari, whom Father Boil had urged Columbus to condemn and punish for alleged disloyalty, hypocrisy and deceit, now proved faithful to the Admiral and to the Spanish to the end, while Margarite and Father Boil, in conspiracy with other malcontents, seized the ships and returned to Spain in the absence of the Admiral on his exploration. A bloody war ensued, many Spaniards were ambushed and slaughtered by

the Indians; but the firm measures of Columbus, aided by the stern military promptness and ability of his brother Bartholomew, led to the seizure and imprisonment of Caonabo and to the utter defeat of the Indians. It was thus that the Indians, towards whom Columbus had commenced the most pacific policy, until it was defeated by his own lawless Spanish subjects, were now the avowed enemies of the white men. As the Jesuit Father, Arthur George Knight, said, Columbus had been forced to become a conquerer in spite of himself. The confederation of the Indians, which had been broken by the seizure and imprisonment of Caonabo, the chief who had united all the other chiefs except Guacanagari against the Spaniards, was now continued by Anacaona, his principal wife; but the difficulty of keeping under subjection the white men, those who formed a very great part of his vice-regal government, was greater still, and while the Indians were subdued and had no mother country to appeal to, the mutinous Spaniards appealed to Spain, and sent thither every form of accusation and vilification against Columbus. In Spain these enemies found confederates in Bishop Fonseca, Margarite and Father Boil, the first of whom was a life-long enemy of Columbus, the second was a rebel against his own chief, in the face of the barbarians whom he also incited to revolt, and the last was a deserter of his flock, a missionary who abandoned his mission, a Vicar-Apostolic who preferred diplomacy to dogma, and the favor of a court to the spiritual vineyard of the Lord. These enemies accused Columbus of every crime their enmity could invent, exaggerated the confusion prevailing in Hispaniola, for which all three of them were in great part responsible, and even intimated that Columbus may have been lost at sea in his cruise to Cuba and Jamaica, for Margarite and Boil had sailed away in his absence. Of course the confidence of the Queen in the Admiral was shaken, and it was resolved to send out another to investigate the administration of Columbus, the condition of the island, and, if the Admiral were dead, to supersede him. Juan Aguado, a man whom, like the traitor Margarite, the Admiral had favored and recommended, was chosen by Fonseca, and in October, 1495, this official arrived at Isabella with four caravels laden with needed supplies; but he bore in his pocket a dubious and elastic commission, a source of unbounded mischief. It might well be suspected that Aguado had been secretly instructed by Fonseca, and that his commission had been framed with purposed vagueness. His arrival was hailed by the malcontents and culprits as the condemnation of Columbus and the justification of the rebels, for he soon joined the latter and intensified the confusion of the island, which he had been sent to allay. Offenders and criminals of every hue now started up and became accusers of the Admiral

and his brothers. Aguado showed himself an insolent upstart, puffed up by a little brief authority. He accused the Admiral, then absent from Isabella endeavoring to quell an Indian outbreak caused by Aguado's supporters, with purposely avoiding him, and he ignored the presence of Don Bartholomew and Don Diego, his brothers and representatives. Aguado was sending out a troop of horsemen to arrest the Admiral and bring him to his presence, while the Admiral, as soon as he received tidings of his arrival, hastened to the city to declare his utter submission to any orders his sovereigns might send. Aguado, exceeding his authority, made numerous arrests, and from the disloyal and guilty, willing witnesses and perjurers, he accumulated a huge mass of testimony against Columbus. The latter saw at once, with such an enemy returning and with Fonseca, Margarite and Boil already in Spain, it was necessary for him to go and defend himself at Court. It was a fortunate event for Columbus (for he had few of the favors of fortune now), that just at this moment were discovered rich gold mines on the Hayna and Ozema rivers. Columbus knew that gold would prove his most powerful defender at Court, certainly with the king. He thought, too, as Hispaniola had not turned out to be Cipango, it might now prove to be the Ophir of Solomon. So important was this discovery regarded that the Adelantado, Don Bartholomew, transferred the headquarters of the colony to that region in the summer of 1496, and thus were laid the foundations of the city of San Domingo.

The Niña, which meant the baby, was the only remaining ship, left from the storms and wrecks; another caravel was built for Aguado. Columbus on the Niña and Aguado on the new caravel, sailed for Spain. Unfortunately the ships were crowded with invalids and home-sick colonists, every one of whom was paraded as an evidence of the Admiral's misrule in Hispaniola. Such was the stormy voyage and such the delay, that provisions became scarce, and Columbus had great difficulty in saving the thirty Indians on board from being eaten by the very Spaniards who had accused him of unnecessary cruelty to the Indians and of sending the cannibal Caribs to Spain that they might be returned as Christian interpreters. They arrived in Spain on June 11, 1496. Caonabo, the brave Indian chieftain, died on the voyage in spite of the tender care of Columbus, of a broken heart.

The machinations of Fonseca, Boil, Margarite and Aguado were now seconded by the poor and miserable condition of the Spanish colonists returned on the ships. Columbus had discovered the new world, but he had never assumed the responsibility for the vices, excesses, sickness, or disappointments of all the adventurers that flocked thither. He now, as on all occa-

sions, acted with characteristic dignity. Remaining at Cadiz he sent a letter to the sovereigns announcing his arrival and his determination to await at Seville their orders. A month's delay seemed to him an unjust requital, to others a condemnation. During this month he wore publicly the brown habit and girdle of the Franciscans, thus signifying his disgust with the world and his inclination to retire to the shades of a spiritual and religious life. The narrow limits of cloister and cell were enough for the revealer of worlds. But there was something that overcame the machinations of his powerful enemies at court. Was it the gold of Hayna and Ozema? Was it not rather the good and generous heart and justice of Isabella?

While Columbus was waiting at the house of his good friend, the curate of Las Palacois, and wearing the garb of a Franciscan monk, he received at the end of a month a letter from the queen thanking him for his services to his country, to his sovereigns, and inviting him to visit them at court, then being held at Burgos, and here he was kindly received; no allusion was made to the complaints made against him, and he readily received promises of ships for a third expedition. The execution of this last promise was delayed by two royal marriages, the son and the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, to the daughter and the son of the Emperor Maximilian, and also by the depleted condition of the royal exchequer caused by the long wars of twenty years with the Moors, and now by the war with France. This delay was a lesser wrong to Columbus, whose life had been already consumed by delays, than the royal edicts of 1495, by which the Spanish sovereigns, in open violation of their engagements with Columbus, had granted to all native Spaniards the privilege of making, at their own risk and expense, voyages of discovery and traffic to the countries discovered by him. Columbus, who regarded his capitulations with the sovereigns as equivalent to an exclusive right, protested in vain against the unjust edict. The subsequent edict of May 10, 1497, which declared that it had not been the royal intention in any way to affect the rights of the Admiral, was a mere soother to his wronged feelings, for it did not prevent the sailing of an expedition only three weeks before, under the special auspices of King Ferdinand, with Vicente Yañez Pinzon as chief commander. Nor did it prevent other expeditions under the former edict. There was a still greater, and latent wrong, in this expedition of Pinzon, for in it sailed Americus Vesputius, who afterwards by error and misconception, but without any known design of his own, received the honor of bestowing his name on the new world. It is certainly one of the greatest wrongs to Columbus, one which now can never be undone, that the world which he discovered was named America instead of Columbia.

The delays which the Admiral now endured afford us an opportunity to mention the important and remarkable part taken by the Holy See in the affairs of the new world ; an intervention which wonderfully exemplifies and exhibits the wisdom even in the temporal affairs of the world, which pointed out that sacred and Apostolic Power as the wisest and providential arbitrator of nations. We have already mentioned that Portugal had been for many years seeking the Indies by the southern route along the west coast of Africa, and had made considerable progress in this great undertaking under Prince Henry the Navigator and subsequent explorers, ending in the discovery of the (*East*) Indies in 1497 by Vasco de Gama. Columbus, in 1492, went in search of the same Asiatic regions by the western or Atlantic route, and he was the first to discover land. He discovered America five years before Gama reached Asia. He and all the world believed that he had found the Indies, and he called the new world he had discovered *The Indies*, and its inhabitants "Indians." Neither he nor his contemporaries ever knew that he had discovered the continents of a new hemisphere, or that the regions he had discovered were other than the Indies of Asia. Dutiful son of the Church he announced his great discoveries to the Holy See. The Indies, Indians, America, were all misnomers. But the continent was there, and Columbus had found it. The name signifieth but little.

Columbus had made his first proposals to Portugal. Spain had won the prize. There were royal heart-burnings in the two courts. While John II. of Portugal had not assented to the proposal of his courtiers to assassinate Columbus, he secretly sent out an expedition in 1481 to rob Columbus of the glory of his conception, and now after it had been accomplished he seriously entertained the thought of sending a small fleet across the Atlantic as soon as possible to take possession of a port, Cathay or Cipango, which Columbus had discovered, as a basis for disputing the claims of Spain. Pope Eugenius V. had expressly conceded "the Indies" to Portugal, and by the treaty of 1479 Spain had solemnly bound herself not to interfere with the discoveries and possessions of her rival. Portugal claimed the Indies. Long and tedious negotiations had taken place between the two rivals, tortuous and selfish in the extreme, and it was difficult to say where the diplomatic prestige lay, whether with wily Ferdinand or with astute John of Portugal. Ferdinand was universally regarded as the superior in heartless diplomacy, but John of Portugal in the end gained most by negotiation and treaty.

It became the province of the Holy See, the common centre of Christendom, to settle a dispute which menaced for ages to come the peace of Christendom. Ferdinand was quick in all matters of

worldly policy, and no sooner had Columbus reached Barcelona in triumph in 1493 than the wily King of Aragon sent an embassy to Rome to ask from Pope Alexander VI. a grant to Spain of "the Indies" discovered by Columbus. Columbus, in his Franciscan cell at La Rabida, and the prior of the convent had counselled together, and the *desideratum* of a line of demarkation between the two great maritime nations by which the new worlds were to be divided between them was solemnly discussed. Columbus urged the court of Spain to come to terms with Rome, and he urged the concession and adoption of a line dividing the east from the west, and granting to Portugal the world east of that line, and to Spain the world west of it. The able Jesuit Father, Arthur George Knight, thus describes the exalted position occupied by Columbus at this time, and after his return from his first voyage to the new world: "The Cross," he says, "had already be enplanted there, but that was only the beginning of the beginning. It was not enough to find a new world. Grave responsibilities devolved upon the finder. Columbus could now speak and be listened to. Kings and Popes would value his advice, perhaps shape their conduct upon it. The destinies of millions of immortal souls were delivered to his keeping." True to his mission, son of destiny and prophesy, as I have shown in the first two articles of this series, Columbus with true genius recommended the now famous and historical line of demarkation, and the Vicar of Christ was the arbiter to fix the crucial line Columbus proposed, and Pope Alexander VI., by Papal Bull of 4th May, 1493, decreed that a line should be drawn one hundred leagues to the west of the Azores and Cape de Verde Islands, and that Spain should be entitled to all the lands west and south of it, while Portugal had already received the concession of the rest of the undiscovered world to the east. Spain thus received an avowed reward for overthrowing Mohammedanism in the Iberian Peninsula, and now an apostolic mission was opened to her in what was supposed to be remotest India. On the following day, May 5th, the Pope issued a second Bull more fully defining the rights of Spain as distinguished from those of Portugal in the interests of perpetual peace. Count Roselly de Lorgues exultantly remarks that this line extended from pole to pole without passing through any of the lands of the earth, perhaps the only line that could be drawn on the earth passing entirely over the waters and not cutting in two any of the lands of the earth. It was the meridian 25° W. Mr. Fiske, in his learned work, "The Discovery of America," says that line of demarkation "was made in the spirit of even-handed justice," and, again, that "the equitable intent of the arrangement was manifest." Father Knight calls the line of demarkation "an inspiration," and Count de Lorgues calls it "a

miracle." The concession was made to Spain on condition of her propagating the Catholic faith in the new world.

The strenuous efforts of Portugal could not move the Pope to to vary the line. But John II. was dissatisfied, and he complained that he had not sea-room sufficient to prosecute his discoveries east and south. Those two wily monarchs, Ferdinand and John II., resorted again to diplomacy. Religion seemed ignored in their diplomacy. These negotiations resulted in the Treaty of Tordesillas, on June 7, 1494, whereby Spain, content with the vast empires she saw to the west, which she acquired by the discovery of Columbus, and in the interests of peace, no doubt supposing that she thus acquired all that was worth having, conceded to Portugal what she asked, and agreed to push the line back and westward three hundred and seventy leagues west of the Cape de Verde Islands, instead of the Papal line of one hundred leagues west. This concession gained for Portugal the vast empire of Brazil. The discovery of Brazil was accomplished by Pinzon and Americus Vespucius in 1497; the latter described it as *Novus Mundus*, a new world; he had no idea that it was embraced in the same continental discovery as that of Columbus; he described these new regions in good faith. It was afterwards that a young German professor of St. Diè, Waldseemuller, in the same ignorance, suggested that the *Novus Mundus* of Americus should be called in his honor America. Americus was friendly to Columbus and never aspired to this honor; it was, almost by inadvertence, that the name of America was bestowed upon the whole and upon both continents of the Western Hemisphere. It was unfortunate that Spain did not insist upon the Papal line of demarkation. It would have saved the empire of Brazil to Spain, would have gained for Columbus the honor of bestowing his name upon the New World, and this country would have been called Columbia. In this instance the wily Ferdinand was outwitted; Portugal got the better of Spain.

After two years of delay, worry, disappointments and distress, the second expedition of Columbus was now ready to sail. An infant colony planted in a distant and new world, which surely needed prompt and efficient sustenance and protection, had thus been left a prey to the most short-sighted neglect. This too at a crisis in its existence. It was two years lost also out of the career of a man who had shown his capacity to add vast empires to the Spanish rule, and boundless realms to Christendom. After enduring two years of petty annoyances and embarrassments from Fonseca and his minions in the Bureau of the Indies, a final and open insult was heaped upon the Admiral, just as he was about to embark on his ships, by a despicable underling of Fonseca, a converted

Hebrew, who felt that he could please his patron by insulting Columbus. The Admiral feeling that in the presence of his officers and crews, his dignity and prestige must be sustained, gave the insolent Jew a personal chastisement on the spot. However just was the punishment, its infliction then and there was an error of diplomacy. It was the only time that we have found that Columbus lost his temper. The circumstance was reported with every exaggeration by the chastised employee of Fonseca to his master, and the latter never forgave it. It is now admitted that he sought such pretexts, even trivial ones, for persecuting his victim. From that moment Fonseca persecuted Columbus with fiendish hatred. The good and venerable Bishop Las Casas attributes to this incident and the consequent increased hostility of Fonseca, the gradual and constant decline of the influence and fortunes of Columbus; for as Father Knight writes, it "was represented in dark colors (at court) when he was not present to defend himself." While the prospects of meeting a pacified and prosperous colony in Hispaniola did not await the Admiral, it was some relief to him to be at sea again, away from the machinations of his enemies, even though his crews, owing to the unwillingness of the people to enlist for the expedition, were composed of the lesser convicts from the prisons, whose imprisonment was commuted to a term of service in Hispaniola. Unfortunate as this policy was, it was cordially approved by the sovereigns when suggested by Columbus, and resulted in disaster to the colony. Some historians of late have cast the whole blame upon Columbus, without admitting the fact that every other course was adopted before resorting to this, but without success. Such was the desperate necessity of the colony and such the delay in getting ships and crews, that Columbus succeeded early in 1498 in sending out two caravels with relief, but he succeeded only after incredible personal labors, humiliations and suffering.

Finally Columbus commenced his third voyage on May 30, 1498, with six ships, carrying about two hundred men besides sailors. He sailed this time from San Lucar de Barrameda, in the name of the Holy Trinity, resolved to name the first land in Its honor, and having in view the discovery of the mainland or continent. The discovery of Trinidad and the Orinoco, of the continent off the coast of Paria, the pearl coast, were the momentous results of this voyage. With slight geographical data the genius of Columbus saw a continent. He arrived at San Domingo on August 30th, exhausted by his fatigues and watchings, and still more by the most painful and prostrating attacks of gout. Renewed wars with the Indians, the rebellion of the Spaniards under Roldan, rebels and Indians joining their forces against the authority of the Spanish government, even Spanish troops sent to resist the rebellion

treacherously joining the rebels, and a continuation of such disorders over a period of two years, were the principal remaining events of this third expedition. They exhausted the resources, broke the power, and endangered the position of Columbus and of his two brothers. The Admiral was compelled by sheer necessity to enter into terms with his enemies and the enemies of Spain, with Roldan and his rebel followers. All attempts to continue the great and momentous work of exploration and discovery were prostrated. Ill fortune deprived the Admiral of the opportunity of revealing the whole continent. The home government failed to sustain the Admiral in the very government with which he was entrusted, and Fonseca, charged with the business of sustaining Columbus, did all in his power to ruin him. Availing himself of the slanders and libels sent to Spain by the most degraded and unprincipled rebels against the government, Fonseca used them all at court to poison the minds of the sovereigns against Columbus. Reprobates returning from Hispaniola found a confederate in the official head of the Indian Bureau, and Fonseca sent them all to court to clamor at its gates for their pay, which they accused Columbus of withholding. Fifty of these scoundrels, at the instigation of the very official who should have arrested and punished them for their crimes and rebellions in Hispaniola, were gathered in one day in the very courtyard of the Alhambra, cursing the defamed and absent Admiral; catching hold of the king's robe as he passed out, and crying, "Pay us! Pay us!" And when the Admiral's young sons, Diego and Fernando Columbus, who were then pages in the queen's service, passed out of the palace, they were hooted at by this rabble of returned culprits from Hispaniola with cries, "There go the whelps of the Admiral of Mosquito-land, the man who has discovered a land of vanity and deceit, the grave of Spanish gentlemen!" All this was music of greatest melody to the embittered and hostile ears of Fonseca, the enemy of Columbus. The Jew whom the latter had chastised for a public act of insolence was dearer to Fonseca than the discoverer of the Indies. Such malice has never been surpassed in human history. Pains were taken to place before the eyes of the avaricious king the depleted condition of the royal treasury, the absence of profitable returns from the Indies, and the irremediable confusion of Hispaniola. The ear of Isabella was made to ring with calumny against the tyrannies of Columbus. Every charge was triumphantly refuted by him or by his historians. At this unpropitious time, however, in the summer of 1497, Vasco de Gama had reached Asia with the flag and ships of Portugal, by the southern African route, and returned in the summer of 1499; this event was adroitly and maliciously used by Fonseca and his minions against Colum-

bus. Nothing that malice and wickedness could suggest was left untried. The discovery of a new world, with its unseen and unknown continents, in a single voyage, was decried as inferior to the reaching of the known and accessible continent of Asia by a new route merely. Portugal was announced as having eclipsed the maritime achievements of Spain; Gama was a real hero, while Columbus was a mere adventurer. Execrations took the place of the pæans of glory which had greeted his triumphant return from the new world. It was not the least feature in the admiral's fall and continued and increasing unpopularity, that he was not a Spaniard, but a foreigner; he was, to use his own words, "absent, envied, and a foreigner in the land."

While Fonseca was struggling for his ruin in Spain, Columbus was struggling to save the Spanish power in the New World. To add to the desperation of his situation, the rebellion of Roldan was supplemented by the descent of Alonzo de Ojeda upon Hispaniola. Ojeda had been treacherously furnished by Fonseca with a chart of the Admiral's discoveries. He like Margarite, Roldan, Aguado, and others, had been raised to notice or power by himself. Such was the completeness of the Admiral's fall that he meditated flight from Hispaniola, together with his two brothers, who shared with him the hatred of his enemies. He was in momentary fear of assassination. In his agony he heard, or seemed to hear, a voice from Heaven, saying, "Oh! man of little faith, fear not, it is I." Taking courage from his vision and from the graces he received, he nerved himself to accept the chalice of woes that for two years had been at his lips. He reconciled to himself Roldan the rebel, and for want of other resources sent him with a force of men against the rebel or invader Ojeda. Then sprang up Moxica with a conspiracy to assassinate both Columbus and Roldan. The latter, under the skilful policy of Columbus, now rendered solid services in sustaining law and order, which lately he did so much to overthrow. Columbus triumphed over the leaders of his enemies in Hispaniola. Ojeda was expelled from the island, Moxica was captured and executed for his crimes at San Domingo. The elasticity of the Admiral's nature would have sustained him, but now in the midst of his efforts for his sovereigns, he received a letter from them, showing plainly that his truthful and honest defence had not prevailed over the machinations of Fonseca and his other enemies. The old adage, that falsehood travels a mile, while truth is putting on its boots, was realized in the case of Columbus. His fall was due entirely to the falsehoods of his enemies.

Columbus had already made great progress in the pacification of Hispaniola; he had sent a detailed and faithful account of the disturbances of the island to the sovereigns, and now at last there

seemed to dawn upon his eventful and painful life, a gleam of hope for a season of repose, and perhaps for realizing some portion of the 'revenues and rewards for the transcendant services he had rendered to his sovereigns, to Spain, and to the world. But all history has never afforded such an instance of disappointment, injustice and downfall. It was just at such a moment of nascent hope, that a fleet was seen entering unannounced the harbor, while Columbus was absent on public business at Fort Conception. No one could now imagine that the comments of this article and of historians universally, on the machinations of Fonseca, were severe, when the sequel comes out, as we are now about to relate.

The chief personage and commander of the fleet that thus so unceremoniously arrived at San Domingo, on August 23d, 1500, was none other than the notorious Francis Bobadilla, an instrument of Fonseca, whom that good hater had induced the Spanish sovereigns, by every sort of misrepresentation and intrigue, to appoint as a royal commissioner to go out to Hispaniola, to inquire into the state of the colony. This royal commissioner had a series of three letters or commissions, the first, second, and third; the second was not to be used in case the first sufficed, and the third was not to be used in case the first and second sufficed. In effect, he was to examine into the conduct of the Admiral, and in case he found him guilty, he was to supersede him. "Ferdinand," as Father Knight observes, "deserves the credit of this strange device, which promoted impartial judicial inquiry, by making it the immediate interest of the judge to condemn the accused." In fact, Columbus had been prejudged and condemned before Bobadilla left Spain. The third letter of the royal commissioner commanded Columbus in the name of the sovereigns to deliver up to Bobadilla all fortresses and ships. In the absence of Columbus and his brother, Bartholomew, Don Diego Columbus, supposing from Bobadilla's astounding insolence and violence, that he was a pretender like Aguado, desired delay until the Admiral could return to San Domingo, and requested that his credentials be produced. Instead of obeying his instructions, the commissioner proceeded in rapid succession to herald forth all three letters which he bore, though they were of graduated and alternative severity. His first act was to seek the favor of all criminals, rebels, and miscreants on the island, and he accordingly set free all the State prisoners, then proceeding on that line, he arrogantly proclaimed his promise to redress all grievances; he seized the residence of the Admiral and occupied it for himself, spoke on all occasions contemptuously of him, and vaunted his own authority to punish him. Columbus received tidings of Bobadilla's arrival and arrogant pro-

ceedings. While he was preparing to return to the city, his impatient enemy sent a messenger for him, and to show him a fourth letter of the sovereigns, brief and severe, which was addressed to the Admiral himself, and without an expression of courtesy or regret, without explanation or a soothing word, read as follows: "Don Christopher Colon, our Admiral of the Ocean Sea, we have charged the Commander Francis de Bobadilla, bearer of these presents, to make known to you in our names certain matters with which he is entrusted. We pray you to yield to him faith and credit, and to act accordingly." On receipt of such a curt letter from his sovereigns, and a peremptory summons from Bobadilla, he at once obeyed and repaired directly to San Domingo, where on his arrival, he was immediately seized by Bobadilla, thrown into prison and loaded with chains. The same treatment was meted out to Don Diego Columbus. When no one in Hispaniola could be found so mean and despicable as to be willing to place the chains upon the Admiral, Bobadilla found such an instrument in an ungrateful and degraded domestic of the Admiral himself. Fearing the resentment and the strong arm of the Adelantado, Don Bartholomew Columbus, Bobadilla was cowardly enough to request the imprisoned and chained Admiral to send an order to his brother to return to San Domingo and submit to his authority. This brave man obeyed his brother's order, returned to the city and was immediately thrown in prison, and in chains. The three brothers were imprisoned apart. Not only was the Admiral imprisoned and chained, he received actual ill-treatment in his helplessness, was deprived of part of his clothing, and placed on insufficient food. He had reason to fear momentary assassination at the hands of Bobadilla; for did not another royal commissioner, sent out by the same Fonseca, inflict judicial assassination afterwards, upon the famous Balboa, the discoverer of the Pacific Ocean?

Bobadilla and his minions scoured the country for accusations and affidavits against his noble prisoner, and he found no difficulty in accumulating an immense mass of perjured testimony, by which every crime, except the crime of impurity alone, was attributed to this fallen hero. When taken from his prison to be carried on ship-board, Columbus thought that he was taken from prison to be killed. He prepared himself for death. On board the ship, the *Gorda*, the heart of Vallejo, his guardian, was melted, and he proposed to remove the chains which Bobadilla had placed on the Admiral, but the latter refused to allow their removal. A reverend author already quoted thus describes the condition of this illustrious prisoner and fallen Admiral: "It was in the name of his sovereigns that he had been chained, and he would not permit any surreptitious alleviation of his sufferings. Wasted by dis-

ease and acute pain, worn out by labor, which never brought repose, accused of causing evils which he had done his best to prevent, tortured by the thought that the poor Indians, whose souls he would have poured out his life-blood to save, were being taught the vices of Christians instead of the doctrines of Christianity, and instead of being led to the waters of baptism, were being driven farther away from the love of Jesus Christ and the hope of Heaven, knowing in the bitterness of his soul, that the testimony of lazy vagabonds and convicted robbers was preferred to his, wounded to the heart by the defection of those who should have been most loyal, and forsaken at last by Isabella the Catholic, his spirit was still unbroken, and he was as great in the day of adversity, as he had been in the day of exaltation."

The following passage from Mr. John Fiske's "Discovery of America" is too forcible to be omitted: "The three brothers were confined in different places, nobody was allowed to visit them and they were not informed of the offences with which they were charged. While they lay in prison, Bobadilla busied himself with inventing an excuse for this violent behavior. Finally he hit upon one at which Satan from the depths of his bottomless pit must have grimly smiled. He said that he had arrested and imprisoned the brothers only because he had reason to believe that they were inciting the Indians to aid them in resisting the commands of Ferdinand and Isabella! In short, from the day of his landing, Bobadilla made common cause with the insurgent rabble, and when they had furnished him with a ream or so of charges against the Admiral and his brothers, it seemed safe to send these gentlemen to Spain. They were put on board ship, with their fetters upon them, and the officer in charge was instructed by Bobadilla to deliver them into the hands of Bishop Fonseca, who was thus to have the privilege of glutting to the full his revengeful spite."

But let us have no more details of this shocking business—Columbus was sent back from the New World, which he had given to Spain, in a Spanish ship, and was landed on Spanish soil, *in chains!*

When Christopher Columbus landed from the ship at Cadiz and walked through its thronged streets in chains, a profound and painful sensation was produced upon the minds of all: it was the same admiral, who in 1493, had entered Spain in triumph, and had stood, the discoverer of a world, before the Spanish sovereigns at Barcelona, and loaded with every honor. Every eye that saw that stately and venerable form bowed down with sorrow, and those hands which had achieved such exalted deeds loaded with chains, was moistened with tears, and every heart was beating in sympathy with the exalted prisoner. Bobadilla and Fonseca had overdone

their work. During his confinement and passage on the *Gorda* Columbus had written with his manacled hands, a letter to a friend at court, a friend of Isabella, Doña Juana de la Torre, nurse of Prince Juan, and from this letter, so full of pathetic fact and sentiment, we quote a brief passage: "If it is a new thing for me to complain of the world, at least there is nothing new in its mode of treating me. It has forced me a thousand times to join battle and I have always stood my ground till now, when neither good sword nor wise counsel can help me. It has cruelly flung me down. . . . The hope in Him who made us all sustains me. His aid is ever near." Doña Juana had read this letter to the Queen, and her eyes became tearful and her heart moved. She immediately despatched a courier to Cadiz to command the magistrate to strike off the chains from the hands of Columbus. Ferdinand, like his friend Fonseca, became alarmed, and he joined in a letter with the Queen to Columbus deploring the shameful misconstruction of the royal orders, and inviting him to court. Ferdinand resorted to the device of tyrants by disclaiming the acts of his subordinates. His subsequent history shows that his crafty heart was with them, and no doubt he had inspired their action. The volumes of perjury which Bobadilla had forwarded, refuted themselves by their excess, and made no impression. Columbus and his two brothers were received at court in a solemn audience, and the sovereigns bestowed upon them every mark of respect and endeavored to make public reparation for the wrongs perpetrated in their names. In a private audience to Columbus a few days later Isabella shed most copious tears, and promised him reimbursement for his losses and restoration of his vice-royalty and other dignities. This last promise was never fulfilled; but this was owing more to the malign influence of Fonseca at court than to the reason of state assigned, that it would be impolitic to entrust the government of such elements as constituted the Spanish rabble at Hispaniola to a foreigner. Mr. Fiske's description of Columbus, with the imprint of the fetters fresh on his wrists, at the Alhambra, is a manly tribute to the unfortunate: "The scene in the Alhambra, when Columbus arrived, is one of the most touching in history. Isabella received him with tears in her eyes, and then this much-enduring old man, whose proud and masterful spirit had so long been proof against all wrongs and insults, broke down. He threw himself at the feet of the sovereigns in an agony of tears and sobs." In speaking of the refusal of Columbus to let his chains be removed and the reaction in his favor, the same author says: "The event—which always justifies true manliness—proved the sagacity of his proud demeanor. Fonseca was balked of his gratification. The clumsy Bobadilla had overdone the business. The sight of the Admiral's

stately and venerable figure in chains, as he passed through the streets of Cadiz, on a December day of that year 1500, awakened a popular outburst of sympathy for him and indignation at his persecutors."

Royal promises, like other pledges of politicians, yield always to influence or policy. If Columbus had been restored to the vice-regal administration of Hispaniola and had been backed by an adequate military force, his foreign birth would not have stood in the way of his successful government. But Fonseca's influence prevailed again and another creature of his, Nicolas de Ovando, knight commander of the military and ecclesiastical order of Alcántara was appointed governor of Hispaniola. The administration under this new government was a full vindication of Columbus. Ovando by his despotism reduced the whites of Hispaniola to such a state of discipline and order as to gain for him the title of a good governor for white men. But his cruelties to the poor Indians, their spoliation and subjugation, their extermination in the most brutal, wanton and perfidious manner, contrast strangely with the milder and juster administration of Columbus. The feudal vassalage of the Indians established under Columbus had been carried under Bobadilla into the *repartimientos*, another name for a modified slavery, and under Ovando into the *encomiendas*, which constituted an unmitigated slavery accompanied with fiendish atrocities. Seldom, if ever, has history had to record such a slavery. Crushed at first with inordinate labor of an agricultural kind, after the discovery of the mines they were immured to cruelest toil therein. If we recall the rush of gold-seekers to California and Australia in modern times, we get a faint glimpse at the crowds of Spaniards hastening to Hispaniola. The miners of California and Australia mostly did their own work, but those of Hispaniola forced it upon an enslaved race with horrors and atrocities that would be incredible, but for the unimpeachable eye-witnesses who have revealed it to us. The only labor which the Spanish miners of 1500 performed was to use the lash. Indians were worked to death without remorse, as it was easy enough and cheap enough to get others. When the poor worm turned or curled up, terrible extermination was the immediate result. The knife or axe slaughtered the Indians by hundreds; other hundreds were burned alive; others still were impaled on sharp stakes, and hundreds were torn to pieces by blood-hounds. If a Spaniard was killed in retaliation, the tally could only be adjusted by calling up fifty or sixty Indians and chopping off their hands. To chop off their hands was nothing, since if they had both hands they were liable to slaughter at any moment. The lives of Indians were cheap indeed. Little Indian children, like kittens or puppies,

were thrown into the water to drown. On one occasion thirteen Indians were strung up in a row, just so high as to let their toes barely touch the ground, while their Spanish tormentors enjoyed the sport of pricking them with their sword-points, so as to prolong their death-writhing agonies. I refrain from mentioning the horrid blasphemies with which the number thirteen was selected by these unworthy Christians. On another occasion a white man was wantonly roasting a number of Indians suspended over a slow fire; and, when their hideous cries awakened a Spanish official in a neighboring house from his siesta-nap, and when he called out to his fellow-demon to kill those wretches at once, the latter coolly gagged the half-expiring innocents and prolonged their tortures and his own hellish enjoyment. The Indians of Hispaniola were exterminated by these hideous cruelties and whole-sale slaughters. So much was this the case that Indian slaves became scarce, and expeditions went out to steal and decoy the poor inhabitants of other islands on board Spanish ships from which they were landed in the mines of Hispaniola and finally most pitilessly sacrificed to the Spaniards' demon of gold. This hideous story is not a tithe of the atrocities perpetrated by white men in the beginning of the sixteenth century in Hispaniola. Can all this be possible? the gentle reader may exclaim; can it be true? Yes, we have it all and sadly much more from the noble and truthful lips of the venerable Bishop Las Casas, who, when he beheld these barbarities, asked himself if it was not a frightful dream. But alas he had the reality before him; it was no dream; would to God, for the sake of our common humanity that it had been a dream! Bishop Las Casas assures us, after relating these countless atrocities of his own countrymen, "all this did I behold with my bodily mortal eyes." Read his "History of the Indies;" its recitals are the saddest pages of human history. In the fourth and last article of this series on Columbus, in the October number of the REVIEW, I shall relate how some Christians, who were not unworthy of that exalted title, raised their angelic voices on earth in opposition to such brutal atrocities, in protest against such an enslavement of man by man, and in vindication of the inalienable right of human liberty. The cruel administration of Ovando was ended by his recall to Spain, 1509, alas! that it should have lasted so long! There are only two things to be said in his favor—he returned to Spain poor, and he left the larger part of his moderate property for the founding of a hospital for needy Spaniards. Why could he not have bequeathed the smaller portion, at least, for the redemption of poor Indians from the power of their ruthless Spanish masters?

Stripped now of his office of Viceroy, from motives untenable on their face, and by actual results proved to be disastrous in the

selection and administration of Ovando in Hispaniola, the brave and energetic spirit of the veteran sailor and Admiral now sought the means and opportunities for a fourth voyage. It is interesting in our day of almost perfect geographical knowledge to recall the errors and speculations of the past. Vasco de Gama had certainly found the real and true continent of Asia, in the interests of Portugal, by sailing around the southern cape of Africa. The first, second and third voyages of Columbus had led to endless speculations as to what part of Asia he had discovered by sailing due west across the Atlantic; but Asia it was believed to be. On the second voyage, while off the coast of Cuba, by command of the Admiral, a notary accompanied by four witnesses proceeded through the crews of the four caravels to make a solemn record of the testimony and belief of every man in the expedition as to what land this was they saw before them, and upon which they had landed; and if any had a doubt as to its being Asia, and as to his power to land there and travel by land all the way back to Spain, now was his time to express his doubt. The notary and four witnesses received the solemn, unanimous and sworn declaration of every man in the expedition that this was no other than the coast of Asia. This solemn proceeding was formally reduced to writing and sworn to by all; it is dated June 12, 1494, and is still preserved in the Archives of the Indies at Seville. This was during the second voyage to the Indies. In the face of all this, where were the rich and prosperous cities of Marco Polo? where was Cipango? where was Ophir? where the Golden Chersonese or Malacca? where Cathay? where Champa or Cochin China? where Japan? where the Indian Ocean? where the domains of the Grand Khan; where the kingdom of Prester John? The recent voyage of Americus Vesputius and Ojeda along the coast of a great continent, extending as far south as what we now know to be the Gulf of Maracaibo, still more befogged the momentous question. In his third voyage to the Indies, Columbus presented the noble spectacle of a single man endeavoring to solve by personal explorations the problem of the earth. The geography of the earth is one thing and the shape of the planet is another. By the former are located and measured the oceans, seas, gulfs, bays and rivers, the continents, islands, peninsulas, isthmuses and other parts of the earth. By the latter is determined, by the principles of applied physical astronomy, the necessary and natural shape of the earth as a planet, forming a part of, and in harmony with, the rest of the planetary system. The science of physical astronomy, as subsequently unfolded by Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler and Newton, was then comparatively unknown. The genius of Columbus, by actual exploration and investigation, was doing the pioneer work of his

race in geography, and was even approaching the applied elements of physical geometry. He had to overcome the errors of the great scientists of his own and of all ages. Hence when he was struggling through the tides and currents near the coast of Paria, breaking through the errors of Toscanelli's map, he reasoned himself into the conviction that the lands he was then discovering formed a continent. We know now, upon scientific grounds unknown in his day, subject always to God's omnipotent power of creation in his own way, that there is but one shape possible for our planet, a once fluid or nebulous mass, which, in due time and place, assumed the planetary duty of rotation, which only shape is that of a spheroid, a little protuberating at the equator and flattening at the poles. Now when he was struggling with his ships up that protuberating rise at the equator, he concluded that this shape must show the earth to be shaped like a pear, rather than like an orange, and must have an apex at the equator like the stem part of a pear, while its lower part was nearly spherical. He saw and felt that he was ascending a gentle slope, as he sailed out of the scorching and smooth sea of the late dead calm; he saw the lovely and enchanting coasts and the rushing tide of the mighty river; he therefore concluded that he was approaching the region of the earthly paradise, and that the Garden of Eden was located on the top of the pear-shaped apex of the earth, and that if he ascended the great river before him he could reach the earthly home of our first parents. Had not Dante located Paradise on a lofty mountain? He gave bold expression to his theory in one of his characteristic letters, and quoted many authorities to sustain it. When he saw the distant land at the delta of the Orinoco, he called it *Isla Santa*, or Holy Island; it was one of the outposts of Eden. His theory was based upon a common opinion in the Middle Ages. He believed that by sailing to the west of that point he should reach the coast of Cochin China, and that the coast on which he had now arrived was either continuous with it, or separated by a strait through which he might sail to the Indian Ocean. His faith in his ability to reach the coast of Hindustan by his western route, which Gama had just reached by the eastern route, was firm as a rock; so much so that he again renewed his vow to the Sovereign Pontiff to furnish an army for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. It was during this interesting period of his life that he compiled that remarkable book, his "Collection of Prophecies Concerning the Recovery of Jerusalem and the Discovery of the Indies," which we mentioned in the first of this series of articles. Mr. Fiske tersely describes the then interesting and highly wrought condition of the Admiral's mind, in these striking words: "It was no doubt the symptom of a reaction

against his misfortunes that he grew more and more mystical in these days, consoling himself with the belief that he was a chosen instrument in the hands of Providence for enlarging the bounds of Christendom."

These observations will enable the gentle reader to clearly comprehend the sentiments, beliefs, motives, aspirations and purposes with which Columbus undertook his fourth voyage to the new world. It consisted of four small caravels of from fifty to seventy tons, and the entire personnel numbered about one hundred and fifty men. He was now again consoled by the strengthening companionship of his brave and faithful brother, Bartholomew, and cheered by the congenial company of his younger son, Fernando, a youth of fourteen. The expedition sailed from Cadiz on May 11, 1502. As Hispaniola was left in great disorder by the misrule of Bobadilla, and many enemies of Columbus were still there, for fear of fresh commotions, he was instructed not to stop at San Domingo on the outward voyage, but might stop there on the return. Hence, on reaching Martinique and Dominica his intention was to sail for Jamaica, thence to his Cochin China, our Cuba, and thence southward along his continuous continental coast until he should solve the great question of an inter-continental passage of water, and, if found, to sail through it into the Indian Ocean. But as one of his vessels was unseaworthy, necessity compelled him to go to San Domingo to get another vessel for his momentous voyage. When he arrived in the harbor he found a squadron of twenty-six or twenty-eight ships about to sail for Spain, and among the passengers were his enemy Bobadilla and the former rebel Roldan. The ships carried an immense quantity of gold acquired by the enslaved toil of the Indians under Bobadilla, and on a ship by itself was the gold belonging to Columbus, four thousand pieces, a part probably of the promised restitution. The practiced eye of this veteran sailor saw indications of an approaching storm. He conveyed this important information to the authorities with warnings to the fleet not to sail, and requested permission to obtain a ship in place of the unseaworthy one in his own fleet. His request and warnings were treated with contempt, and he was ordered away from the very city he had founded, and from the harbor of safety for his ships in the storm he had predicted several days beforehand. The fleet with Bobadilla, Roldan and many other enemies of Columbus put to sea. The predicted storm came as he had warned them; it was a hurricane. Almost the entire fleet was wrecked; Bobadilla, Roldan and all the enemies of Columbus and the ill-gotten treasure were sent to the bottom. The only ship that arrived safely in Spain was the one that carried the Admiral's gold. He had himself the further comfort of riding the storm in

safety when all others perished, and he proceeded on his voyage. Las Casas witnessed these remarkable and miraculous events with awe and reverence.

The casualties of the sea carried his fleet to the Island of Guanaja and Cape Honduras. The fleet sailed south and eastward in search of the inter-continental strait from the end of Honduras to the beginning of Nicaragua. Veragua was passed, and the voyage continued upon information derived from the natives as to the existence of the peninsula on the east side of which he was, and that on the other side was another great sea by which he concluded he would reach the Ganges in ten days; the Indians also informed him that his present course would bring him to a narrow place between the two oceans. Columbus thus got the first tidings of the Pacific Ocean; was he not its virtual discoverer? Observations were made during this cruise of the countries passed and their inhabitants; evidences of a semi-civilization were seen all around; copper knives and hatchets, artistic pottery, fine and beautifully dyed cotton cloths, the chicha or maize beer, heavy and powerful weapons, and women dressed as modestly as the Moorish women of Granada, great houses built of stone and adobe mortar, walls adorned with carvings and picturegraphs, well preserved mummies, and abundance of gold, with rich ornaments of which the natives were plentifully adorned. Columbus proceeded on his course east of Puerto Bello and found that the two oceans were divided from each other by a narrow strip of land, now known as the Isthmus of Panama, and not connected together by a pass through which he could reach Hindustan and the Indian Ocean. He turned his prows and retraced his course.

While Columbus sought only to ascertain the true geography of the earth, at this important point, it was a disappointment to him that no passage was found to the regions so lately discovered by Gama. It was an important service rendered to human knowledge to have thus settled the momentous question. His enemies then and now have accused him of a lust for gold. Let them now behold him passing by the rich gold-bearing regions of this extended coast without stopping to seek or acquire it, for he was in search of the solution of a great and geographical, scientific and commercial problem. Washington Irving thus notices this important cruise and its motives: "Nothing could evince more clearly his generous ambition than hurrying in this brief manner along a coast where wealth was to be gathered at every step for the purpose of seeking a strait, which, however, it might produce vast benefit to mankind, could yield nothing else to himself than the glory of the discovery."

Debarred as he was from going to San Domingo, where he had

founded his colony, and having ascertained that no inter-oceanic passage to Eastern Asia existed, Columbus resolved to found another colony, and selected for this purpose the region known as Veragua, reputed as so rich in gold. It was this place which gave the name to the dukedom of Veragua, which was afterwards conferred upon his family in lieu of all hereditary titles. The cruise down and up the coast was attended with frequent and severe storms; on one occasion the Adelantado and his crew attended Mass and received the sacraments on shore from the only priest, Father Alexander, a Franciscan, while the other crews, fearing immediate shipwreck, confessed to each other and prepared for death. Columbus was prostrated with sickness; a boat's crew perished in the waves; the Franciscan Father died, and the Admiral, his young son, his brother, and all the crews gave themselves up as lost. A huge waterspout was approaching the ships and threatened instant destruction to all. The sailors on their knees recited the Gospel of St. John; the prostrate Admiral made a last effort and recited with a loud voice the opening passages of the same Gospel, and made the sign of the cross with his sword; Las Casas relates that the waterspout turned aside. The coast was named the Coast of Contradictions, from its numerous disappointments, sufferings and misfortunes.

Having arrived at the river Belen, in Veragua, on January 6, 1503, the ships crossed the bar. Columbus was unable to move from his bed, but the Adelantado made a military expedition to the village of the cacique Quibian, and found him and his people hostile, crafty and deceptive. Gold abounded in great quantities, but the wily Quibian led the Spaniards to the mines of a neighboring chief with whom he was at war, and where there was less gold than in his own country. Diego Mendez, a faithful and gallant follower of the Admiral, made an expedition into Quibian's country and reported a conspiracy of the chief and his tribe to assail and destroy the Spaniards; then the Adelantado made another expedition and captured the chief and his family; Diego Mendez and Bartholomew Columbus, in these and other perilous services, seemed to have charmed lives. The indomitable cacique made his escape, though chained and tied with ropes, and secretly prosecuted his hostile preparations. Columbus deemed it necessary to carry his ships beyond the bar of the river for safety, leaving within one ship and a garrison on shore. An attack on the feeble garrison was repulsed with almost superhuman valor; a boat's crew sent by the Admiral for water were all murdered but one man, who swam ashore and gave the alarm. The position of the whole expedition was perilous beyond hope; to remain was to meet certain death from the natives—to go to sea in worm-eaten

ships were certain shipwreck. Columbus, now prostrated with disease, suffered intense mental agony for the safety of his brother and people on shore, and for his son and himself, and his ships. It was with the utmost difficulty and peril that he succeeded in rescuing his brother and the rest of the garrison on shore from the fierce and murderous attacks of the infuriated Indians. In his despondency delirium seized the Admiral; he regarded it as a vision, for in it he heard a messenger from heaven admonish him, "O! foolish and slow of heart!" "He was then reminded," says Father Knight, "of the mercies which God had shown him, and finally encouraged with the inspiring words, 'Fear not! have confidence! all these tribulations are written on marble and not without cause.'"

Compelled to abandon one of his caravels, the *Galician*, to its fate at Belen, he succeeded in rescuing his brother and the remnants of the garrison. Having sailed from this inhospitable shore, they had not proceeded far before another ship had to be abandoned. All the crews were crowded on two ships. They were now seeking safety at San Domingo. The ships were perforated with holes made by the worms. As the water poured into the ships, the men worked incessantly at the pumps day and night. It seemed as though they could not even reach San Domingo—surely they would not be repulsed from that, his own port, as they had been thence repulsed by Ovando on the outward voyage. Having reached a group of islands on the coast of Cuba, the ships were further disabled in a violent storm. He procured some provisions from the shore and again made for San Domingo. But it was impossible to proceed in such miserable shells, and to save the lives of all on board, he was compelled to run the vessels ashore in a bay on the island of Jamaica. The two stranded ships were so full of water that they would have sunk very soon. Columbus regarded the saving of his crews as a miracle. The ships settled firmly in the sand and became a fortress for the wrecked Admiral and his companions. The faithful and expert Diego Mendez won the favor of the natives, and secured from them provisions.

Columbus spent an entire year of exile on the island, where he was shipwrecked—it was a terrible year. The faithful and brave Diego Mendez volunteered to make the hazardous trip in a canoe across the sea from Jamaica to Hispaniola, and in his second attempt accomplished the perilous feat. Ovando was appealed to to save his countrymen from their perilous position. He made promises of relief, but as Mr. Fiske justly states: "He was a slippery knave, who knew how to deal out promises without taking the first step toward fulfilment." After eight months Ovando sent

one Escobar, one of Roldan's rebels, an enemy of Columbus, to go on the tantalizing trip of approaching and looking at the shipwrecked Admiral and Spaniards, and then departing without giving them other relief than a barrel of wine and a side of bacon. Well has the question been asked, was not Ovando seeking the destruction of his rival?

But such was the cross that Columbus had to bear, that to the perils and hardships of shipwreck and exile on a savage coast, was added the revolt of his own men under two brothers named Porras, and the infusion of disaffection and hostility among the natives. A sorry sight it was when Spaniards approached the savages of Jamaica with inducements to withhold food from, and finally to attack and murder, their shipwrecked countrymen. Columbus, himself stricken with disease, was abandoned by most of the able bodied men of the garrison, and left with few others than invalids like himself. The Adelantado was a tower of strength, however. The rebels seized the small boats of the Admiral and made three attempts to row across the sea to Hispaniola, but three times the waves repulsed the dastards. Returning to the island they overran the country as robbers, outlaws, and marauders; they were likened to a pestilence.

Under such circumstances the Indians refused the usual supplies of food to the Admiral and his faithful companions, for all which when supplied, they were amply repaid. In order to relieve the garrison from starvation, the Admiral, whose active mind was fertile in expedients even when racked by disease, resorted to an exceedingly ingenious device in order to obtain food from the natives. He predicted beforehand an approaching eclipse of the moon, in order to work upon the fears of the natives, and so exactly did the moon become obscured at the very moment foretold by him, that the Indians, so deeply impressed with his supernatural knowledge and communion with the heavens, commenced at once to bring in the usual supplies, for which the Admiral paid them as before. Some of the invalids who were obliged to remain with the Admiral by their illness and weakness, as soon as they grew strong on the food he procured for them, joined the rebellion of the Porras brothers. Using to their advantage the strange appearance and departure of Escobar in the ship, the rebels pretended and announced that the Admiral had conjured up a phantom ship, to deceive his followers with false hopes. Negotiations with the rebels resulted in nothing, so that the resolute and brave Adelantado marched against them with fifty men, recent invalids but high-spirited men, with an ultimatum, the answer to which was a fierce onslaught of the rebels. But the Adelantado and his few brave Spaniards completely routed the more numerous, and

more robust band of rebels, and he took the chief a prisoner with his own hands.

When Ovando saw the agent and friends of Columbus raising a ship at the Admiral's expense to go for him and his men, he yielded to the popular and general outcry against himself, which resounded even from the very pulpits of San Domingo, and added another ship of the government. Now, as on many other occasions, the extreme cruelty of the Admiral's enemies, caused a reaction in his favor. He generously took on board the ships with himself and his true friends the rebels, who had yielded to his sway only when subdued. They all arrived in a starving condition at San Domingo, on August 13, 1504. A strange and mixed crowd greeted the return of the Admiral at the city he had founded, and divers were the sentiments of this diversified assembly. Among them was young Hernando Cortes, the future conqueror of Mexico, a kinsman of Ovando, and a warm admirer all his life of Columbus. Father Knight remarks that, "he too found an enemy in Fonseca." Ovando, in deference to public sentiment, pretended to receive Columbus with joy and to treat him with respect; but his true sentiments were made known by his conduct, for he immediately liberated Porras, and threatened punishment to the faithful followers of the Admiral for killing some of the rebels. Columbus's heart recoiled at the atrocities he saw and heard of in Hispaniola, but could not prevent them. He could place no trust in Ovando as regards his own position. He availed himself of the first opportunity of returning to Spain. He carried with him and paid the expenses of the very men who had wronged him so much in his exile, even when he was in want of means for himself. After a stormy voyage, and a narrow escape from another shipwreck, he arrived at the port of San Lucar de Barremeda, on November 7, 1504, and made his way to Seville. He was now broken in health and fortunes. It seems miraculous that the old Admiral could have survived such misfortunes, hardships, and sufferings; that he should have arrived again in Spain alive.

Had he not now fulfilled his destiny, and performed the prophecy? *Circumspice!* Look around and see the continents and nations that Columbus discovered. His glory survives his enemies. The old and the new worlds unite to do him homage. Four hundred years have not obscured his fame, but have exalted his name. The New World, which he gave to Leon and to Castile, and to the world, has emerged from thralldom, and achieved its liberties. Now the free and grateful nations celebrate the great event, which, four hundred years ago, was achieved by Christopher Columbus. *TE DEUM LAUDAMUS.*

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

THE HIERARCHY IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES.

WE have taken this as a brief and convenient title for the present article, though it requires some explanation in order to make clear what our precise thesis will be. It literally denotes only the constitution of the sacred ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church, with a very common restriction to the order of bishops as being the chief pastors.

Viewed as a mere question of polity, episcopacy would not be of vital and essential importance apart from other questions relating to the nature and attributes of the historical episcopate. In point of fact, however, the question of the origin of the episcopate in the early Church is connected with so many doctrines and religious practices of the highest importance, and in such a way, that the determination of this question determines implicitly the whole issue between two radically diverse and opposite theories of the Christian religion, the Catholic and the Protestant. At any period in ancient Christianity, when episcopacy was undoubtedly in possession, essential and substantial Catholicism surrounded it as the full-orbed sphere surrounds its centre. Wherever episcopacy exists as an order instituted by the Apostles, the episcopal character is believed to be conferred by an ordination imparting a grace transmitted through an unbroken succession of bishops from Jesus Christ. This grace is believed to be the plenitude of sacerdotal gifts, including power to consecrate and offer the Eucharist as a true sacrifice, to consecrate priests, and to do all other acts properly belonging to the office of a chief pastor and ruler in the Church. This doctrine of the sacramental and sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry is one part of the general doctrine of the sacramental nature of the Christian Church, of sacramental grace in general, of the entire system of Catholicism as opposed to Protestantism. The true, genuine concept of hierarchy in the highest grade of the Christian priesthood—*i.e.*, in the apostolic episcopate, of which the supreme pontificate is the culminating point—implies the hierarchical nature of the other orders of baptized Christians and of the whole Church in all its members who have been made, through the redemption of Christ, “a kingdom and priests unto God.”

This is the comprehensive sense in which we use the term “hierarchy” in the title of this article, as denoting the whole sacred order, dogmatic and moral, in the organic unity of the Catholic

Church, of which the existence of the apostolic episcopate is the sign and mark.

The precise point to be proved is, that the episcopate is no merely ecclesiastical institution developed from a mere presbyterate, but a divine and truly sacerdotal order, founded by Jesus Christ in the Apostles, and through them continued in the bishops of the Catholic Church and their successors, but pre-eminently in the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter in his supreme primacy.

The method we have chosen to follow in our argument is to select an early date in the history of the Church, at which, by the confession of the best non-Catholic scholars, the episcopate and Catholicism were in possession, and to trace backward the path of Christian movement to its origin.

The exact point of departure from which to begin this process may be taken at an earlier or a later date, between A. D. 150 and A. D. 325, without sensibly affecting the premises or the conclusion of the argument. For the sake of convenience, we will take the date A. D. 200, the last year of the second century.

At this date, Victor I. was Bishop of Rome, Septimius Severus was Emperor, St. Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons and nearing the period of his martyrdom, Tertullian was forty years of age and in the prime of his Catholic life, Clement of Alexandria had just closed his career as the head of the Catechetical School, and Origen was a promising boy of fifteen. Polycrates was Bishop of Ephesus, and the dissensions respecting the observance of Easter were at their height. It was somewhere near this date that St. Dionysius of Alexandria and St. Cyprian were born. The interval of comparative rest for the Church from persecution, from A. D. 180 to 202, was near its end, and the fifth great persecution under Severus about to begin. The evangelization of England, had, perhaps, commenced under Pope Elutherius with the conversion of the tribal chieftain, Lucius, and a considerable number of Britons. Christianity was widely spread and rapidly progressing through the Roman Empire and beyond. In Asia Minor, proconsular Africa, Egypt, Gaul, Spain, Germany, and throughout the east, there were numerous churches, some of which were very flourishing, and the multitude of Christians was great. The epoch was momentous. The third century, which witnessed such a vast extension of Christianity and its most fearful and decisive struggle with heathenism, ending after one hundred and thirteen years in a triumphant victory, was beginning. This was emphatically the age of martyrdom, glorious in its Christian heroes and sages; its countless host of confessors of the faith; its foundations, cemented in blood, upon which the colossal edifice of Christendom was built in later ages.

Surely it is a deeply interesting question: What was the Chris-

religion, in its faith and its organic constitution, at this moment when it was emerging from its childhood of one hundred years since the death of the last of the Apostles who nurtured its infancy, and was coming forth in the vigor of its youth, armed with its panoply, for the invasion and conquest of heathendom? It is this religion which is the genuine, real, and historical Christianity,—a world-power and a world-religion. Any different sort of Christianity is spurious, a mere creature of theory, and (in so far as it has received any concrete embodiment in modern times) a new and human invention, whose authors have no lineage among the ancient saints and martyrs.

It is a plain and indisputable historical fact that the Christianity of the year 200 was Catholicism. The salient feature and certain mark of its integral, organic composition is found in its hierarchical constitution, as a universal confederation of episcopal churches, with the Roman See as the centre of unity.

The episcopal constitution of the churches throughout Christendom is the first and main point to be considered, after which follows the Roman primacy as the keystone of the unity of the universal episcopate.

Episcopacy was in universal and indisputable possession before the beginning of the third century, according to the most eminent Protestant scholars. We will take two of these, among the latest and most learned representatives of modern Protestant scholarship, Lightfoot and Harnack, as sufficient authorities in support of our assertion.

Some may object to Lightfoot as an Episcopalian and a bishop in the Church of England. But this is not a valid objection to him as a witness without Catholic bias. He was no High Churchman with semi-Catholic proclivities, but a thorough-going Protestant, having no belief in the Sacrament of Order and the Christian priesthood. His opinions about the origin and nature of primitive episcopacy are those which were commonly held by the earliest continental Reformers, are maintained by many of the best non-episcopal divines at the present time, and are most decidedly un-Catholic opinions.

Dr. Lightfoot, after a careful survey of the period preceding our chosen date of A. D. 200, remarks:

“The notices thus collected present a large body of evidence establishing the fact of the early and extensive adoption of episcopacy in the Christian Church. The investigation, however, would not be complete unless attention were called to such indirect testimony as is furnished by the tacit assumptions of writers living towards and at the close of the second century. *Episcopacy is so inseparably interwoven with all the traditions and beliefs of men like*

*Irenæus and Tertullian, that they betray no knowledge of a time when it was not.*¹ Even Irenæus, the earlier of these, who was certainly born and probably had grown up before the middle of the century, seems to be wholly ignorant that the word bishop had passed from a lower to a higher value since the apostolic times. Nor is it important only to observe the positive (though indirect) testimony which they afford. Their silence suggests a strong negative presumption, that while every other point of doctrine or practice was eagerly canvassed, the form of church government alone scarcely came under discussion."²

We may remark in passing that this last statement, evidently a just one, cannot be explained except on the presumption that the Apostles established everywhere episcopal government.

"Unless we have recourse to a sweeping condemnation of received documents, it seems vain to deny that *early in the second century* the episcopal office was firmly and widely established. Thus, *during the last three decades of the first century*, and, consequently, during the lifetime of the latest surviving Apostle, this change must have been brought about.

"In this way, during the historical blank which extends over half a century after the fall of Jerusalem (from A. D. 70 to A. D. 120), episcopacy was matured and the Catholic Church consolidated."³

We have then, according to Lightfoot, in A. D. 200, episcopacy as the universal church polity, already old, and having a tradition behind it going backward toward the "historical blank" which separates the year 120 from the year 70 in respect to its origin, and to the year 120 for its firm and wide establishment.

Dr. Lightfoot has also a testimony to papal power at the close of the second century :

"With Victor, the successor of Elutherius (A. D. 189), a new era begins. Apparently the first Latin prelate who held the metropolitan see of Latin Christendom, he was, moreover, the first Roman bishop who is known to have had intimate relations with the imperial court, and the first also *who advanced those claims to universal dominion* which his successors in later ages have always consistently and often successfully maintained. 'I hear,' writes Tertullian scornfully, 'that an edict has gone forth, aye, and that a peremptory edict; the chief pontiff forsooth, I mean the bishop of bishops, has issued his commands.' At the end of the first century the Roman Church was swayed by the mild and peaceful

¹ Here, and in all other quoted passages where italics are used, they are from the writer of the article.

² *Comm. on Philipp.*, p. 227.

³ *Id.*, pp. 201, 207.

counsels of the Presbyter-bishop Clement; the close of the second witnessed the autocratic pretensions of the haughty Pope Victor, the prototype of a Hildebrand or an Innocent."¹

Even Daillé and other writers of the second generation of French Protestants, who attacked so vehemently the apostolic institution of episcopacy, allowed that it was established *as early* as the beginning of the third century. Of these, Lightfoot remarks:

"The strange audacity of writers like Daillé, who placed the establishment of episcopacy *as late* as the beginning of the third century, need not detain us."²

Prof. Harnack, of Berlin University, is the first man among the rationalists, who are nominally and officially doctors in the Lutheran Church of Germany. In his remarkable work on the "History of Dogma," he undertakes to trace the origin and progress of Catholicism.

Dr. Harnack does not say in so many words that the episcopal constitution of the churches was universal in the year 200. It is implied, however, in many passages, that it was so, long before that time. He writes:

"It is plain that *towards the end* of the third century the development—apart from communities situated in the outer circumference—almost everywhere had reached the same final point, Catholicism, essentially in the sense which we to-day attach to the word, has been attained in the great majority of the communities. It becomes now probable *a priori* that this revolution of Christianity, which is indeed nothing else than the projection of the Gospel upon the world-wide empire of the period, has been accomplished under the guidance of the community of the capital city of the world, the Roman Church; and that, therefore, 'Roman' and 'Catholic' have from the beginning stood in a special mutual relation."

It is a question here of something more than episcopacy, viz., of a close confederation of dioceses in provinces, and of provinces in exarchates and patriarchates. The churches of the periphery are those of Edessa, Nisibis, etc., to the east of the great patriarchate of Antioch and beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. We know that all the churches founded by Apostles or later apostolic missionaries in the remotest parts were episcopal and

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 224. The references are to the edition of 1890. It must be remembered that when Tertullian wrote these words he had already become a schismatic and a heretic. Perhaps some of the Corinthian schismatics may have used similar language of Pope Clement I.

² *The Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., St. Ignatius, vol. i., p. 391, London, McMillan, 1889.

in Catholic communion. Hence, they are no exception to the rule.

Dr. Harnack further says:

"The assumption that Paul and Peter labored in Rome and founded the Roman Church (Dionysius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Caius), must have lent an eminent distinction to the Roman bishops at the moment in which the bishops came to the front as the more or less sovereign lords of the churches, and were recognized as the successors of the Apostles."¹

The specifications under this head refer to Pope Victor and his immediate successors, and even look back to his predecessors.

All through the exposition of his theory of the gradual construction of Catholicism, it is to the second century that he ascribes the growth of the ecclesiastical organization, specifying the causes which in his opinion produced the result:

"That out of the Christian congregations a real confederation under the primacy of the Roman congregation came into existence" (p. 407).

It is his opinion that:

"First in consequence of the so-called Gnostic crisis (second half of the second century), which in every sense made an epoch, a firm organization was attained, and the apostolic-episcopal constitution founded" (p. 183).

Nevertheless, he says that:

"The determining premises for the development of Catholicism were present already before the middle of the second century" (p. 185).

"The second century of the existence of Gentile Christian congregations received its stamp through the victorious warfare with Gnosticism and the Marcionite Church, through the gradual formation of an ecclesiastical doctrine, through the suppression of the old Christian enthusiasm, all in all through the establishment of a great ecclesiastical bond, which, as being alike a political community, a school, and an association for worship, reposed upon the firm foundation of an 'apostolic' rule of faith, an 'apostolic' collection of Scriptures, and, in fine, also an 'apostolic' organization, the Catholic Church" (p. 273).

"From two converging lines of development arose Catholic Christianity. In the one, fixed external criteria were established for the definition of what was Christian, and these criteria were proclaimed as *apostolical* institutions. The baptismal confession was

¹ *Lehrb. der Dogm.—Gesch.* xiii., 1. Excurs. zum 2 und 3, Kap., pp. 400, et seq.

elevated into an *apostolical* rule of faith, otherwise an apostolical law of faith; from the writings read in churches an *apostolical* collection of Scriptures was formed and placed on an equal footing with the Old Testament; the constitution of a monarchical episcopate was given out as *apostolical*, and the quality of successors of the Apostles was ascribed to the bishops; the worship, finally, was shaped into a mysterious celebration, which was likewise referred back to the Apostles. A strictly exclusive church, having the character of a doctrinal, religious, and administrative corporation, was the result of these institutions, a confederation which, in increasing measure, drew the congregations into itself and caused all irreconcilable formations to shrink away. The confederation rested finally upon a common confession, but not only was this conceived to be a 'law,' but was very speedily completed by new criteria. To point out in consequence of what necessity the publication of a new canon of Scripture came about, what circumstances demanded the establishment of living authorities in the congregations, and in what mutual relations apostolic rule of faith, apostolic canon of Scripture and apostolic office were placed, is one of the most important tasks of the investigation of the history of dogma, which however cannot, unfortunately, be perfectly fulfilled. The development ended with the construction of a clerical estate, at the head of which stood the bishops who united in themselves all conceivable powers as teachers, priests, and judges, controlled all the forces of Christianity, guaranteed the purity of the same, and thus became in every respect the guardians of the Christian laity" (pp. 275, 276).

"The clergy held complete dominion over the congregations from the beginning of the second third of the third century" [A. D. 233] (p. 287).

The second line of development is that of the formation of a dogmatic and philosophical theology, the finding of a formula of reconciliation between faith and science. In a long exposition of this process of dogmatic development, together with that of ecclesiastical development, Dr. Harnack endeavors to show how the Christianity was formed which conquered the world, gave a solution of the intellectual and moral problems which controlled thought for centuries, and became an empire within the political empire of the Roman world,—in a word, Catholicism. The Imperial Church, Catholicism, was finished, he says, at the time when Diocletian undertook the reorganization of the Roman Empire (p. 380).

Enough has been said to justify the position taken at the beginning of this article, that at the date A. D. 200 the episcopal organization was in universal and undisputed possession throughout the Church.

It remains now to show that the organization of the Church under bishops, who were the chiefs of the clergy and congregations, was strictly hieratic and hierarchical. Sacerdotal or hieratic consecration and character, sacerdotal or hierarchical order and government, were of the essence of Christianity, principally existing in the Catholic episcopate, according to the theoretical and practical idea of Christianity in the second century.

The hieratic, sacerdotal character of the whole Church, in virtue of which all its members partake in a royal priesthood, is often put in opposition to the idea of the priestly character and office of the clergy. But the truth is, that it is precisely this common priesthood of Christians which is the reason why their chiefs must have a special priesthood. The Church is one great sacrament. It is not necessary to prove, what is manifest and undeniable, that baptism has always been regarded as the laver of regeneration, a sacrament imprinting an indelible character, imparting sanctifying grace, and giving the recipient a right to the kingdom of heaven. By this sacrament a Christian is specially consecrated in body and soul to the service of God in the Church, and bound in a sacred fellowship with all other children of God in the one mystical body of Christ. This mystical body, originating in a sacrament, must have a continuation and increase of sacramental life and communion, organic functions and ministries, a diversity of integral parts and members, all in conformity with its essence. It being hieratic in its essence, there must be hierarchical order in its constitution. Its principal organs and members must have special hieratic qualities and functions, just as the organs of the body of man, because he is a rational animal, must be specially endowed and fitted to subserve his exercise of all the operations of sensitive and intellectual life.

In like manner the sacerdotal character of the Head of the Church, Jesus Christ, is made an argument against the sacerdotal character of His ministers, whereas it proves the reverse. Jesus Christ is Prophet, Priest, and King, in and over the Church. He is the "Apostle and High Priest" of the household of God, a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedech. For this very reason His ministers must have a prophetic, sacerdotal, and royal character and office.

He formed His Church primarily and principally in His Apostles. The gifts which He possessed by a native right, especially the fulness of the Holy Spirit, He imparted to them, and through them to the multitude of the faithful. The Church was formed by a participation in the doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles. The essence of the apostolic character and office was priesthood in all its plenitude, including the prophetic and royal attributes which

spring from it and give it perfection, and culminating in the supreme apostolate of St. Peter. This plenitude of the priesthood the bishops of the second century, with the full assent of all the faithful, claimed to have inherited by episcopal consecration through a direct and unbroken succession from the Apostles; and the successor of St. Peter in the Roman See likewise claimed to have inherited by virtue of that succession the prerogatives of his universal episcopate.

The spinal column of the complete, integral, organic constitution of the priesthood is the right and power of offering sacrifice to God, as the special and supreme act of worship, thanksgiving, expiation, and impetration. Priest and sacrifice are correlated terms. Jesus Christ is a Priest, or rather He is *the* Priest, anointed and consecrated by the Holy Spirit, primarily and specially, as being set apart and devoted to the offering up of Himself, the Lamb of God, the Divine Victim, by His death and the shedding of His blood on the Cross, in obedience to the command of His Father. By this act of obedience He rendered a homage to the sovereign majesty and dominion of God, of infinite worth, equal to the worthiness and right of God to receive the worship due from the creation to the Creator, from dependent beings to their absolute Lord, to receive from His works the glory which is their final cause. In this worship is included a return of thanksgiving equal to the value of the gifts conferred by the love and goodness of God on all His creatures, a condign satisfaction for all the sins of the world by which He was deprived of the glory due to Him, and an impetration founded on an equivalent merit of all the graces which the Divine Redeemer chose to ask for all those in whose name He appeared as Mediator before the face of His Father.

Priests and sacrifices in the Old Law were only foreshadowings of the one and sole Priest and Victim, Jesus Christ. He alone is, by intrinsic character, a Priest, offering an intrinsically meritorious sacrifice, *i.e.*, Himself, in one oblation only once offered (in its principal act and mode) by blood-shedding and death, as a Victim on the Cross. He alone can continue the great act of His priesthood, in the New Law, by an oblation in another and secondary mode of the same Victim, Himself, which continues and applies in a mystical manner (without any repetition of the blood-shedding and death accomplished once for all upon the altar of the Cross) the offering of the merit of His obedience to the Father, in worship, thanksgiving, expiation, and intercession. He alone could and did institute the Sacrifice of the New Law, and He alone could and did offer up to God, and give to His disciples, His own sacred body and precious blood, under the species of bread and wine, in the first celebration of the Eucharist. The Apostles could repeat

this act of consecrating and offering the Eucharist and giving it to the faithful only by receiving from Christ a communication of His priestly character and power. They could transmit this character to others only by virtue of an additional power communicated to them by Christ and in the way prescribed by Him. They could only act as His ministers, vicariously, and inasmuch as He had appointed and promised to exercise His power through the medium of their agency when He commissioned them as His legates and representatives.

Priesthood in the Christian Church is correlated to the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Jesus Christ, present in the consecrated species of bread and wine in the Eucharist, by that very act and by the nature of the solemn rite which represents and renews the sacrifice of the Cross, is there in the attitude of the Lamb of God who has been slain, offering His merits before the face of His Father. The specific character of Christian priesthood is therefore the power to consecrate the Eucharist. The Cross of Mount Calvary is the central object of the Christian religion. The Eucharistic altar represents it in the Christian temple. It is the central spot in the building. The walls, aisles, decorations, and towers are the environment of the altar. The Church is a place for the offering of the Sacrifice of the New Law, in which all rites and observances culminate. The Holy Eucharist is the sacrament of unity. The Catholic Church is one, chiefly by offering through the ministry of priests, in unity of faith, hope, charity, and apostolic fellowship, this mystic oblation in which the principal Priest is one and the Victim one; and by being united with one another, with Christ, and with the Father, in the Holy Spirit, by sacramental communion.

When the Sovereign Pontiff celebrates at the high altar of St. Peter's, with the princes of the Church and the ministering clergy around him, in the presence of a multitude of the faithful, the Church as one, holy, catholic and apostolic, is most perfectly represented and realized.

Jesus Christ, elevated on the Cross, drew all men to Himself around the Cross. The Pope, at the altar, draws all the faithful to himself as the Vicar of Christ, the High Priest. Every bishop celebrating at the high altar of his cathedral, with his clergy and people around him, likewise represents and realizes the unity of the Church. And the priest in an humble village church exemplifies the same universal fact. There is a multiplication of sacramental species, but only one Lamb who is offered and received undivided by each communicant. There is a multitude of individual priests but only one priesthood, in which all share with the Supreme Pontiff the sacerdotal honor and power, and with whom all the faithful participate in receiving the same Eucharist.

Priesthood, in all its extension and comprehension, includes something more than power to offer sacrifice. In the act of offering sacrifice, the priest appears before God as the representative of the people, exercising an office of mediation in their behalf. He is also the representative of God before the people, exercising on behalf of God an office of mediation. The generic character of priesthood is mediation and intervention between God and man in respect to all things which belong to sanctification and salvation. Jesus Christ, who is both God and Man in one Person, is the Mediator reconciling humanity to God. The prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices are included in the general office of mediation. He reveals the truth, He accomplishes the redemption, He guides, directs, and governs the Church of the adopted sons of God, in fulfilment of His mission as the Christ, the Anointed, making His humanity the channel of all the gifts of grace of which in His divine nature He is the author and source. All this is expressed in the titles given Him by St. Paul, "Apostle and High Priest." The same mission which He received from the Father, the apostolate and the pontificate, He communicated to His chosen Apostles. In their hands He left the New Testament, the legacy bequeathed in dying to His heirs, the faithful in all time; the Sacrament of the Eucharist, with all the other sacraments; the faith and law of the Christian religion; the ministry of grace and reconciliation; teaching authority and governing power. The mission was perpetual, and implied the power and command to provide for a succession to all the apostolic office except that part of it which was of its own nature transient because completely and once for all accomplished by the foundation of the Church and the original promulgation of the New Law.

In the second century it was the universal tradition in the Church that the succession to the apostolate was in the Catholic episcopate; in the bishops, who were priests, teachers, judges, and rulers, possessed of plenary authority, in one organized, corporate body under the Roman Church and Bishop as its head. This was the Catholicism of A. D. 200.

The testimony of St. Cyprian proves this abundantly. It is convenient to cite from his works, because he wrote more copiously and explicitly on the very points at issue than earlier writers had done, particularly as to certain general aspects of that early Christianity. He was born and flourished in the period immediately succeeding the epoch of St. Irenæus, St. Victor, and Tertullian, but his testimony reaches back to that epoch, for there are no traces of any change having taken place, much less of any innovation in doctrine or polity introduced by him. He was educated in the Catholicism of the second century, and all his energies were ex-

erted to preserve and defend the ancient Catholic tradition against every kind of schismatical and heretical aggression. His episcopate, which began two years after his conversion, lasted only ten years, which were spent in laboring for the defence of the Church of Carthage and the Church of Rome against pagan persecution and the treason of internal enemies. He had no time and no inclination for speculative theorizing, and if he had indulged in any vain ambition to new-mould Christianity, he would have lacked the power and the means to influence the Church at large. Even in that one contention which he had with Rome and the general body of the Church outside of his own and one or two other provinces, he was not consciously and intentionally an innovator. He rested on the authority of his predecessors, and followed a local and partial, which he mistook for an ancient and Catholic, tradition. And in this struggle his party was worsted, and in the end forced to submit to the judgment pronounced from the first by Pope Stephen. Moreover, all the statements of St. Cyprian, which are so clear and undisputed in matter of dogma and polity, are supported by previous authorities running back through the second and first centuries to the time of St. John the Apostle, so that he is an authorized spokesman for that entire period. There is no more conspicuous or noble personage in that glorious age than St. Cyprian, whether in respect to his high rank as the prelate next in dignity in western Christendom to the Roman Pontiff, his ability and energy as a ruler and teacher, his magnanimity and intrepidity of conduct and exalted Christian virtue, or his fortitude as a confessor and martyr of the Catholic faith. His whole career,—short, yet crowded with events and achievements enough to fill up a long life,—and his most precious works, present a brilliant picture and exhibition of the genuine Catholic Christianity of that early period which he adorned. He is a witness who could not have been deceived, and who was too sincere and holy to be a deceiver in the momentous matter of religion.

In his person and office, St. Cyprian is a living witness to the hierarchical organization in strict corporate unity of the Church of his period. He was not only Bishop of Carthage, but Primate of all Africa Minor, including six ecclesiastical provinces, over each of which the senior bishop presided as Primus. He writes to Pope Cornelius:

“Since our province is very widely extended, and has also Numidia and the two Mauritanias joined to it, . . . it was our pleasure that letters should be written (which was also done) to all holding positions in those regions, so that all our colleagues should firmly adhere to you and to your communion, that is, to the unity and charity of the Catholic Church” (Ep. xlv., *ad Cornelium*).

One brief sentence from another letter sufficiently expresses this doctrine of the unity of the Church under episcopal regimen, which St. Cyprian abundantly and emphatically teaches throughout all his writings.

"There is one Church divided by Christ through the whole world into many members, and there is also one episcopate diffused through the whole number of many bishops united in concord" (Ep. lii., *ad Anton.*).

Again he writes :

"The blessed Apostle Paul shows forth the sacrament of unity, saying : ' There is one body and one spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God.' Which unity we bishops who preside in the Church are specially bound to keep with firmness and to vindicate, that we may make manifest that the episcopate also is one and undivided. . . . There is one episcopate, a part in which is held by its single members in solidarity" (De Unit. Eccl.).

St. Cyprian frequently and explicitly deduces the authority of bishops from apostolic institution and succession to the Apostles.

"Deacons ought to remember that the Lord chose Apostles, *i.e.*, bishops and prelates ; but after the ascension of the Lord into Heaven, the Apostles constituted deacons for themselves as ministers of their episcopate and of the Church. Wherefore, if we can venture to oppose God who makes bishops, deacons may venture to oppose us by whom they are made" (Ep. lxx., *ad Rogat.*).

"We labor and are bound to labor especially for this, that we may secure, as far as in us lies, that unity which was imparted by the Lord and through the Apostles to us their successors" (Ep. xlii., *ad Cornel.*).

So also Firmilian :

"The power of remitting sins was given to the Apostles, to the churches which they, being sent by Christ, established, and to the bishops who have succeeded to them by a vicarious ordination. But the enemies of the one Catholic Church in which we are, and the adversaries of us who have succeeded to the Apostles, vindicating for themselves against us unlawful priesthoods, and erecting profane altars ; what else are they than Korah, Dathan, and Abiron?" (*Firmilian to Cyprian*).

This last citation from the Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a predecessor of St. Basil, strengthens the force of the testimonies of St. Cyprian, showing conclusively that his doctrine was not an invention of his own, but the common tradition of the eastern as well as the western Christendom.

Harnack sums up the doctrine of St. Cyprian on the unity of the Church in the apostolic episcopate, as follows :

"According to Cyprian, the Catholic Church, to which all the lofty biblical prophecies and declarations are applicable, is the *one* saving dispensation out of which there is no salvation, and moreover it is such, not only as the communion of the genuine apostolic faith in the sense that this is an exhaustive definition expressing the entire concept of the Church, but she is such as a confederation subsisting in organic unity. This church rests, therefore, entirely and solely upon the episcopate which, as the continuation of the apostolic office and armed with all the power of the Apostles, is its support" (*op. cit.*, pp. 345-346).

St. Cyprian's concept of the Church as strictly bound together in organic unity, and of the episcopate as one, is totally diverse from the notion of a mere alliance among a great number of independent bishops, each one ruling over a distinct church; which is mere congregationalism. The organic unity of the Catholic episcopate supposes and requires a constitution and order in the hierarchy to which single bishops are subject, an authority to which they are amenable. As unity in a local church is effected by the subordination of all its clergy and laity to one legitimate bishop, so the unity of the bishops and their churches in a territory, and of all the bishops and churches in the world, must be effected by a more extensive application of episcopal authority and jurisdiction, proportioned to the extension of the united parts, and, in respect to the whole extension of the Church, *universal* and supreme. In point of fact, from the earliest period of which we have a distinct account in history, the bishoprics grouped themselves around metropolitan sees having a lesser or greater pre-eminence as their bishops presided over provinces, exarchates, or patriarchates, the three Petrine sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch taking precedence of all, and Rome possessing the universal primacy; it being, as Harnack expresses it, "a recognized fact that the Roman congregation held the presidency among the circle of sister congregations" (p. 410).

St. Cyprian held the position of primate of Africa from his predecessors in the See of Carthage. This see was itself subordinate to the Roman See, by reason of its dignity as the patriarchal see of the west, to say nothing of its universal primacy. We have already seen the admission of Lightfoot that Pope Victor "held the *Metropolitan See of Latin Christendom*." The entire history of St. Cyprian's administration manifests a constant correspondence with Rome, even while during an interregnum the see was administered by Roman presbyters. In these relations, the admitted superiority of Rome over Carthage is manifest. And the same superiority over the churches of Gaul is recognized in the letter which St. Cyprian wrote to Pope Stephen, requesting him to listen

to the petition of Faustinus of Lyons and other bishops, in behalf of which his own aid had been invoked, that Marcian of Arles, a partisan of Novatian, might be deposed and another substituted in his place (Ep. lxxvii., *ad Stephan*).

The pre-eminence of metropolitan sees and primates, being evidently and by universal consent of purely ecclesiastical institution, could not possibly give the requisite solidity to the grand structure of Catholic unity, founded on the unity of the episcopate. The subordination of bishops, all equal in respect to their ordination, under the metropolitan regimen, would have been lacking in a sufficient principle of right and obligation, if it had not had a centre and source of apostolic and divine authority in a supreme, universal episcopate confided to the hands of a successor to St. Peter's principality and located in one Supreme, Apostolic See. As the unity of single churches had its key-stone in the bishop who was a representative and Vicar of Christ by apostolic and divine appointment, so the unity of the universal church required a key-stone in the primate of the Catholic episcopate, the Vicar of Christ in the government of the whole Church. On the same principle which demanded that because there is one God, one Christ, one Faith, there should be one bishop in each local church, it was necessary that there should be in the Catholic Church one Bishop of whom all bishops were colleagues; and thus a solidarity of the episcopate was founded, instead of a mere alliance of independent bishops and churches. In the supreme pastoral charge over the whole body of the clergy and faithful committed by Christ to St. Peter, and bequeathed by St. Peter to his successors in the Roman See, the bishops as successors to the colleagues of St. Peter in the apostolate shared with their chief episcopal dignity and power. In the presidency over the collective episcopate, a delegated, subordinate pre-eminence was shared by the several grades of archbishops, from the metropolitans of provinces to the patriarchs. Thus the actual organization of the Church made practically possible and reduced to real existence the grand ideal of one flock, in one fold, under one shepherd, preserving Catholic unity even when the bishops were numbered by thousands, the clergy by hundreds of thousands, and the faithful by tens of millions.

St. Cyprian, who is surpassed by none in his firm grasp of the idea of Catholic unity and the strong bond of this unity in the Catholic episcopate, does not fail to see and to present to view the key-stone of this arch of unity in the Roman Church, where is the chair of Peter, and the succession of the heirs of his primacy :

"The sentence that the Church is 'founded upon Peter,'" says Dr. Harnack (p. 348, note 2), "Cyprian has very often expressed."

"Peter also, to whom the Lord commits his sheep to be fed and guarded, upon whom he established and founded His Church," etc. (De Hab. Virg.).

"There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one Chair founded by the word of the Lord upon Peter (Ep. xl., *ad plebem*).

"Peter, upon whom the Church had been built by the same Lord, speaking once for all, and answering in the voice of the Church, says Lord, to whom shall we go?" (Ep. lv., *ad Cornel.*).

"There is one Church, founded by Christ our Lord upon Peter, in respect to the origin and rule of its unity, *origine unitatis et ratione*" (Ep. lxxx., *ad Januar.*).

"He builds the Church upon one, and although, after His resurrection He gives equal power to all the Apostles, nevertheless, in order that He might manifest unity, He disposed by His own authority the origin of that same unity as beginning from one" (*De Unit.*).

"The Lord gave that power first to Peter, upon whom He built the Church, and from this source He established and exhibited the origin of unity" (Ep. lxxiii.).

St. Cyprian constantly recognizes the Roman Church as the See of Peter, and the bishop sitting in the Chair of Peter as his successor in the primacy. In a letter of apology addressed to Pope Cornelius he writes :

"We know, that in giving instruction to all those who were going on a voyage, that they should not make their voyage with any scandal, we exhorted them to acknowledge and hold fast to the *root and matrix of the Catholic Church*."

He then goes on to speak of the letters sent to the bishops throughout his extensive province concerning the canonical election of Cornelius :

"In order that all our colleagues may firmly acknowledge and hold *your communion, that is the unity and likewise the charity of the Catholic Church*" (Ep. xlv.).

"Cornelius was made bishop by the judgment of God and His Christ, . . . when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter and the dignity of the sacerdotal chair, was vacant, . . . when the tyrant (Decius) would hear with more patience and equanimity that a rival prince arose against him than that a rival priest was constituted at Rome" (Ep. lii.).

"After these things they dare, moreover, having a pseudo-bishop instituted for them by heretics, to set sail and carry letters from profane schismatics to the chair of Peter and *the principal Church whence sacerdotal unity took its rise*, not reflecting that those to whom they went were Romans (whose faith is proclaimed as worthy

of praise by the Apostle) *to whom perfidy cannot have access*" (Ep. lv., *ad Cornel.*).

The resistance of Cyprian and Firmilian to the decree of Pope Stephen respecting the baptism of heretics, and the language used by these prelates on that occasion, are cited as evidences that they did not recognize the Papal supremacy. A calm and careful consideration of the whole case shows, however, that the two great bishops of Carthage and Cæsarea, with their colleagues who acted with them, did not oppose the primacy in principle, but only what they regarded as an abuse of authority in respect to a matter which they held to be merely disciplinary, and not pertaining to Catholic dogma. The utterances of St. Cyprian, when he was in the heat of this controversy, have not the same value with those of a former period; and, in so far as the two classes of texts are in contradiction with each other, the latter ones ought to be disregarded. Harnack says on this head:

"Cyprian has, undoubtedly, in his conflict with Stephen, put himself in contradiction with his earlier views on the importance of the Roman See for the Church; views which, however, he had put forth in a critical period, when he stood shoulder to shoulder with the Roman bishop" (*Lib. cit.*, p. 349).

Apart from St. Cyprian's doctrine respecting the primacy of St. Peter and his successors in the Roman See, and the historical evidence furnished by his whole career in the episcopate to the supremacy of Rome over Carthage, the very conflict between Cyprian and Stephen shows in the clearest light the primacy which was *claimed* and *exercised* at that time by the Pope.

Having fully proved that St. Cyprian teaches the continuance of the apostolic office by succession in the Catholic episcopate, and pre-eminently in the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, it remains to show that he regarded this office as in the strict and proper sense sacerdotal.

The writings of St. Cyprian are so pervaded by the sacerdotal idea that it seems superfluous to cite particular passages. Indeed, it is admitted by all that he held and taught most explicitly that Christ established a priesthood in the Church, conferred by ordination and possessed in all its fulness by bishops, with whom presbyters share the gift in an inferior degree.

It will be enough to cite a passage from Harnack:

"The definitive conclusion of the old-Catholic Church idea, as it completed itself in the second half of the third century, is, perhaps, most distinctively exhibited in the quality of *priesthood* which was acquired by the clergy, and which gave to it the highest importance. . . . Its significance is shown by the use made of it in Cyprian and the first six books of the "Apostolical Constitutions."

The bishops (respectively also the Presbyters) are priests, inasmuch as they alone are empowered to offer the sacrifice *as representatives of the congregation before God*, and inasmuch as they, *as representatives of God before the congregation*, impart or refuse the divine grace. In this sense, they are also judges in God's stead. . . . The divine grace already appears as a sacramental consecration of an objective kind, whose communication is reserved to *spiritual* persons chosen by God. . . . The 'serving at the altar and celebrating of divine sacrifices' (Cypr. ep., 67) is the distinctive function of the priest of God; but beyond this, *all* rites of worship belong exclusively to him, and, moreover, Cyprian understood how to derive the ecclesiastical government of the bishop from the priestly office; for, as priest, the bishop is *antistes Christi (dei)*, and herein is the right and duty founded to guard the *lex evangelica* and *traditio dominica*. As *antistes dei*, which the bishop becomes through the apostolic succession and the laying on of hands, he has also received the power of the keys, and therewith the right to impart or withhold the divine grace. In Cyprian's concept of the episcopal office, the apostolic succession and the position of representative of Christ (*i.e.*, of God) balance each other; also, Cyprian sought to blend together these two elements (Ep. 55, 'Cathedra Sacerdotalis')."

One passage from St. Cyprian will suffice as a specimen of the manner in which he always sets forth priesthood as the chief and distinctive character of the episcopal office even at its summit in the person and chair of the successor of St. Peter. In a letter to Pope Lucius, the immediate successor of St. Cornelius, written on the occasion of his return to Rome from exile, St. Cyprian writes :

"We have lately congratulated you, most dear brother, when the divine condescension conferred upon you a double honor in the administration of His Church, as equally a confessor and a priest; and now we congratulate you and your companions and the whole brotherhood no less that the benign and abundant protection of the Lord has brought you back again with the same glory amid the praises of all to your own; so that the pastor should return to the feeding of his flock, the captain to the command of his ship, and the ruler to the government of his people; and it is made manifest that your exile was so divinely disposed, not that the bishop should by his exile be driven away and separated from his church, but that he should return to the church with an increase of power. . . . A sudden persecution having lately broken out, the secular power all at once assaulted the Church of Christ, and the Bishop Cornelius, that blessed martyr, and all of you, in order that the Lord might show for the confusion and overthrow of

heretics which is the Church, who is its one bishop chosen by the divine ordination, who are the presbyters joined in sacerdotal honor with the bishop, which is the united and true people of Christ" (Ep. lviii., *ad Lucium Papam*).

It is the principal and distinctive office of the priest to offer sacrifice. Therefore, in the writings of St. Cyprian, the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ offered upon the altar as the Sacrifice of the New Law and given to the faithful in communion, is continually placed in apposition with the doctrine of the Christian priesthood.

In a letter written to one Cæcilius, St. Cyprian condemns an abuse which had crept in, among some ill-instructed Christians, of sometimes celebrating the Eucharist with pure water instead of wine mixed with a little water. He says:

"Since some, either by ignorance or simplicity, in sanctifying the cup of the Lord and ministering to the people do not do that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the founder and teacher of this sacrifice, did and taught, I have thought it as well a religious as a necessary thing to write to you this letter. . . .

"In the priest Melchisedech we see prefigured the Sacrament of the Sacrifice of the Lord. . . . And that Melchisedech was a type of Christ the Holy Spirit declares in the Psalms, saying (from the person of the Father to the Son): 'Before the morning star I begat thee; thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech'; which order is surely this, coming from that sacrifice and thence descending, that Melchisedech was a priest of the Most High God; that he offered bread and wine; that he blessed Abraham. For who is more a priest of the Most High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered that very same thing which Melchisedech offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, His Body and Blood? . . . If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the Chief Priest of God the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ who imitates that which Christ did, and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered" (Ep. lxx., *ad Cæcil.*).

"When, therefore, He says that whoever shall eat of His bread shall live forever, as it is manifest that those who partake of His Body and receive the Eucharist by the rite of communion are living, so on the other hand we must fear and pray lest any one, who being withheld from communion is separate from Christ's body, should remain at a distance from salvation; as He Himself threatens and says: 'Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye shall have no life in you.' And therefore

we ask that our bread—that is Christ—may be given to us daily, that we who abide and live in Christ may not depart from His sanctification and body" (*De Orat. Dom.*).

There remains only one more prerogative of the episcopate to be noticed, viz., that it is the depository of the apostolic tradition of the faith, and therefore by its teaching is the proximate rule of faith to all the members of the Church.

St. Cyprian's doctrine of the unity of the Church, as the one and only institute of salvation built upon the episcopate as its foundation, necessarily implies the infallible doctrinal magistracy of the episcopate. Schism is separation from the communion of lawful bishops, heresy is a departure from their dogmatic teaching. It is necessary to be obedient to their teaching authority and their ruling power in order to be united with the Church and with Christ. Separation from this communion entails a forfeiture of grace and salvation. The greater part of St. Cyprian's writings are a polemic against schismatics and heretics; and therefore the necessity of communion with the one true Church is everywhere emphasized and insisted upon in the most explicit manner. His teaching is most distinctly and decisively *Catholic* in the sense that all the gifts and graces of God have been confided to the Church, and from her are to be received, through sacerdotal and sacramental ministrations, by individual believers. This is the significance of the apostolic succession in the doctrine of St. Cyprian. The Apostles committed to chosen men, their successors, the plenitude of the sacerdotal gifts and powers which they had received from Christ, the Chief Apostle and Pontiff, by immediate divine authority and mission from the Father.

The character of priesthood consists specifically in the power to consecrate and offer the Holy Eucharist, the sacrifice of the New Law. This power was communicated to presbyters also, as well as bishops, who were therefore associated with bishops in the proper dignity and office of the priesthood. The superiority of bishops over presbyters in respect to the priestly office was derived from their distinct and higher consecration, giving them the plenitude of the priesthood, the most complete and perfect sacramental grace conveyed by ordination and transmitted by an unbroken succession of bishops from the Apostles. This plenitude of priesthood and of the sacramental grace of order consists, specifically, in that full power over the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist by which they can not only consecrate and offer, but also preserve and perpetuate in the Church this heavenly gift by transmitting the priesthood to bishops and presbyters ordained by their hands. They are the fathers in the sacerdotal order, in which presbyters are their sons. As all other priestly powers and offices spring out

of the specific character of the priesthood which is a consecration to the office of offering sacrifice, pre-eminence and superiority in all these powers and offices belong naturally to those who possess the plenitude of the priesthood. They succeed to the fulness of ordinary apostolic power as pastors, rulers, custodians of the faith and sacraments, teachers and judges of Catholic doctrine, colleagues of the head and chief of the episcopate, the successor to St. Peter's supreme apostolic primacy. The bishop is the priest by pre-eminence and in the most excellent sense, and in this is rooted the essential necessity of the episcopate for the being as well as for the well-being of the Church. It is necessary because the bishop is created not merely by a legitimate election and appointment, but by a distinct, sacramental ordination, which a presbyter must receive from a bishop in order to become a bishop, and because no ordination to the priesthood is valid except episcopal ordination. The validity of all sacramental acts which depend on the sacerdotal character of the minister, and, specifically, the validity of the consecration of the Eucharist, the greatest of all the sacraments, depends on the transmission of sacerdotal power from Christ through the Apostles and their successors.

There is, therefore, a heaven-wide difference between the Catholic doctrine of the episcopate and any kind of Protestant conception which leaves out the character of priesthood in the Christian ministry. An episcopal constitution of church polity in which the clergy are mere elders and overseers over whom a superintendent presides, whether this polity is regarded as established by the Apostles or as a development from congregational and presbyterian elements, lacks the backbone and marrow of Catholic hierarchy. It is easy to show the excellence and advantages of episcopal polity, and that no other can so well unite single communities of Christians into large confederations, especially such as transcend national boundaries. Many Protestants have recognized this truth, not only among adherents of the episcopal church of England and its offshoots, but among members of other sects. For instance, that very enlightened and religious monarch, Frederick William IV., of Prussia, ardently desired to have all the Protestant sects united in one communion under episcopal regimen. But if this union were attainable, and were actually brought to pass, it would not produce a Catholic, Apostolic Church. A genuine sacerdotal order and the apostolic succession are wanting in Protestantism. Even in those oriental communions where a valid episcopal succession has been preserved, the sacrament of unity has been broken, and a truly Catholic episcopate does not exist; consequently, they make no part of the Catholic Church but are mere sects, schismatical aggregations of fragments broken off from the grand edifice of Catholicism.

This grand, hierarchical edifice, this Catholic Church, built on the foundation of an episcopate established by the Apostles with the fullness of sacerdotal gifts and powers, appears in the writings of St. Cyprian as an already universal, world-wide institution, as the traditional, genuine, orthodox Christianity, in opposition to all heretical and schismatical pseudo-Christian counterfeits.

This is a conclusive proof that Christianity was identical with Catholicism in the year 200. Cyprian was no innovator. He received the tradition of his predecessors, such as it was in his childhood and before his birth. There is no sign of any difference in dogma, in the essentials of the liturgical and sacramental rites, or in the principles and substantial forms of ecclesiastical organization among different parts of the Church, nor of any alteration which took place during the third century. The Christianity of the third century was inherited whole and entire from the second century, and was handed on to the next age, when it bloomed forth in all its splendor in A. D. 313 and 325, the epoch of Constantine and the First Council of Nicaea.

To return now to the second century. The evidence which has been adduced from the first half of the third century has served to cast a light backward upon the second, and to make the testimonies which it furnishes to the hierarchical constitution of the Church more intelligible. Our immediate purpose is to go backward from the point of departure taken in the beginning, viz., the year 200, through the second into the first, in order to prove the apostolic origin of the Catholic hierarchy.

The universal establishment of episcopacy, and the pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome, in the second century, have been already shown in the first part of this article; and the concessions of high Protestant authorities have been quoted. I will add one more citation from Neander to the same effect:

"Very early, indeed, do we observe in the Roman bishops traces of the assumption that to them, as successors of St. Peter, belonged a paramount authority in ecclesiastical discipline; that the *cathedra Petri*, as the source of apostolic tradition, must take precedence of all other *cathedræ apostolicæ*. . . . In the Montanist writings of Tertullian we find indications that the Roman bishops already issued peremptory edicts on ecclesiastical matters, endeavored to make themselves considered as the bishops of bishops—*episcopos episcoporum*—and were in the habit of speaking of the authority of their '*antecessores*'" ("Hist. of the Church," Bohn's Ed., i., 296).

We have already seen what Protestant authors say of Pope Victor, and they say similar things of Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus. The heresies and sects of that early period were more dangerous to Christianity than the persecutions. The heresies which sought to

undermine and destroy the fundamental articles of the creed, the Trinity and the Incarnation—the sects of Gnostics, Marcionites, Novatians and Montanists—were extensive, active, aggressive and formidable. It was chiefly the authority and power of the Popes, aided by the Catholic bishops, which prevented them from destroying Christianity and suppressed them in the course of time, as Neander admits. Harnack endeavors to prove, in the most elaborate manner, that the canon of Scripture, the establishment of the dogmatic creed, the consolidation of the hierarchical organization of the Church, the total and complete Catholicism which triumphed in the beginning of the fourth century and became historical Christianity, were the product of the struggle with these sects. He is entirely wrong in his conception of Catholicism as a substitution of a new religion in place of the primitive Christianity. But he is right so far as this: that it developed its principles, its doctrines and its discipline; that it grew and strengthened itself; that it manifested its real nature and became consolidated, by means of the conflict with heresy and sectarianism. Hence the bitterness with which Tertullian, when he had lapsed into Montanism, assailed the hierarchy, and especially the Roman See. And it is precisely by these bitter and sarcastic attacks of his on the Roman pontiffs that he has furnished such striking evidence of the power which they claimed and exercised, and to which the Catholic Church submitted.

But Tertullian, in his orthodox writings, has laid down the principles by which his own conduct as a sectarian, and all the positions taken by other heretics and schismatics, are most unequivocally condemned. It is well known how highly St. Cyprian esteemed, and how assiduously he studied these admirable treatises of the orthodox Tertullian. His life extended from A. D. 150 the probable date of his birth, to A. D. 220 the probable date of his death. He is a witness to the genuine Catholic Christianity of the whole of the second century, as this was universally believed to have been received from the Apostles. In his treatise “On Prescription against Heretics,” it is his object to establish a rule of apostolic and orthodox doctrine against all heresies whatsoever. He testifies distinctly and explicitly to the fact that the Catholic Church existed in unity of profession throughout the world, and he makes this unity a test of the truth.

“Is it likely that so many churches, and they so great, should have gone astray into one and the same faith? No casualty distributed among men issues in one and the same result. Error of doctrine in the churches must necessarily have produced various issues. When, however, that which is deposited among many is found to be one and the same, it is not the result of error but of

tradition. . . . Let them then produce the original records of their churches ; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, coming down in due succession from the beginning in such a manner that their first distinguished bishop shall be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles or apostolic men, a man, moreover, who continued steadfast with the Apostles. For this is the manner in which the apostolic churches transmit their registers ; as the Church of Smyrna, which records that Polycarp was placed therein by John ; as also the Church of Rome, which makes Clement to have been ordained in like manner by Peter. In exactly the same way, the other churches likewise exhibit those whom, as having been appointed to their episcopal places by Apostles, they regard as transmitters of the apostolic seed. . . . Come now, you who would indulge a better curiosity, if you would apply it to the business of your salvation, run over the apostolic churches in which the very chairs of the Apostles are still pre-eminent in their places. . . . Achaia is very near you, in which you find Corinth. Since you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have the Thessalonians. Since you are able to cross to Asia, you get Ephesus. If thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence also we have authority. That Church how happy ! into which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood ; where Peter had a like passion with the Lord ; where Paul is crowned with an end like the Baptist's."

St. Irenæus is a witness to doctrine and discipline in the Catholic Church, not only during the period of from one-half to two-thirds of the second century in which he lived, but also during the first third of the same century, and the last decennium of the first in which his teachers had been bred up in the Christian faith by apostolic men. He was born of Christian parents in Asia Minor, somewhere between the years 115 and 140, was educated in Smyrna, and was the pupil of St. Polycarp, Papias, and other venerable presbyters of that early time. His testimony goes back through St. Polycarp and other disciples of the Apostles to the period of St. John, and is therefore of the highest value and authority in respect to apostolic Christianity. Moreover, he is a witness in respect both to the east and to the west. Trained up in Asia Minor, he visited and resided for years at Rome, made himself acquainted with the traditions of other churches, and became finally Bishop of Lyons, where he was crowned with martyrdom about A. D. 202. What remains to us of the writings of St. Irenæus in a Latin version suffices to furnish a very distinct and, in respect to the most important matters, a quite complete account of the Christian doctrine and order of the first half of the second century, as it was received from the first and handed down

to the third. He was principally engaged in confuting heretics, and setting forth in opposition to them the Catholic principles of genuine, apostolical Christianity. His expositions and arguments have a striking similarity with those of Bossuet and other great Catholic polemical writers against the modern Protestant sects.

St. Irenæus was the great Catholic doctor of his age, in respect to both profane and sacred learning, superiority of intellect and power of reasoning, purity of doctrine, the apostolic spirit, and the high Christian virtues of a confessor and martyr of the faith. The entire Church of his period speaks by his mouth, and the age which followed gave its unanimous sanction and approbation to all his teaching. His works are the best and purest source of information respecting that Christianity which was Catholic and orthodox in the age immediately succeeding the apostolic. And, although we have to regret the loss of some of his works, and of the original Greek text of the greater part of those which are extant in a Latin version, what we have is amply sufficient to give a clear and complete idea of his entire system.

In the first place he testifies to the Catholic unity of faith and organization existing in that Church which was in communion with the great sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Carthage, and other political and ecclesiastical centres throughout and beyond the geographical limits of the Roman Empire.

"The Church, although dispersed through the whole world even to the extreme limits of the earth, has the faith which was received from the Apostles and their disciples, which is in one God," etc. . . . "and this faith and doctrine, received, I say, as we have before affirmed, the Church, although dispersed through the whole world, as if it inhabited one dwelling-place, preserves with the highest zeal and carefulness, and, as having one soul, and one and the same heart, to all these nations equally accommodates the faith, and with an admirable consent, as if having but one mouth, preaches, teaches, and hands down these doctrines. For, although there is great diversity among the languages of the world, the efficacy of tradition is one and the same everywhere. Hence, those churches which are situated in the German regions do not have another belief or tradition; nor do those which have their seat in Spanish or Gallic regions, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Africa, or in the Mediterranean parts of the globe. But as the sun constructed by God is one and the same in the universal world, so also the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all men who desire to come to the knowledge of the truth" (Con. Hæres., 2 i., c. 10).

"We ought not to be still seeking among others the truth, which

is easily received from the Church ; since the Apostles have most fully placed in it, as in a depository of treasure, all those things which pertain to the truth, so that every one who wishes can take from it the water of life. For this (the Church) is the entrance of life, whereas all others are thieves and robbers. Wherefore it is a duty on the one hand to avoid these, and on the other, with supreme diligence, to seek for and appropriate those things which are of the Church, that is, the tradition of truth. What now ought to be done? Even if there is a discussion concerning some lesser question, we should have recourse to the most ancient churches in which the Apostles were conversant, and to receive from them what is certain and actually clear in respect to the question in hand. And even if the Apostles had not left to us the Scriptures, would it not be a duty to follow the order of the tradition which they delivered to those to whom they committed the care of the churches? To this ordinance many nations of barbarians assent, that is, of those who believe in Christ, having the saving doctrine written in their hearts by the Spirit without parchment or ink, and diligently keeping the ancient tradition" (iii., c. 4).

In another passage St. Irenæus still more clearly teaches that the apostolic tradition was committed to the bishops with a teaching magistracy which continued the inspired, infallible teaching originally delivered by the Apostles as the rule of Christian and Catholic faith. And not only does he explicitly declare this infallible magistracy of the Catholic episcopate in general, but also the pre-eminence in the episcopate of the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter.

"Therefore, the tradition of the Apostles manifested in the whole world can be seen in every Church by all who wish to discover what the true doctrines are; and we can enumerate those who were instituted bishops in the churches by the Apostles and their successors, even to our own time, who have never known or taught anything like the madness which is vented by these persons. And certainly, if the Apostles had known recondite mysteries which they taught the perfect separately and concealed from the rest of their disciples, they would with most special care have entrusted them to those men to whom they committed the churches; for they desired that these should be very perfect and irreprehensible in all things whom they left after them as their own successors, delivering over to them their own place of magistracy; from whose exemplary conduct great advantage would ensue, whereas their lapse from rectitude would be the cause of the utmost calamity. But since it would take too long to enumerate in a book like the present one the succession of all the churches, by merely exhibiting the tradition of that greatest and most ancient (*i.e.*, pre-eminent

in dignity) Church, which is known to all, founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome,—the tradition of faith received from the Apostles and proclaimed to all men, and which has come down even to us by the successions of the bishops,—we bring to confusion all those who assemble in unauthorized meetings at their own pleasure for the sake of vain glory, or because they are blinded and misled by false opinions. For with this Church, on account of her more powerful principality (pre-eminence, headship, authority, supremacy), it is necessary that every Church, that is the faithful everywhere dispersed, should agree, in which (in communion with which) Church has always been preserved by the faithful dispersed that tradition which is from the Apostles. The blessed Apostles, having founded and instructed the Church, handed down the episcopate of the administration of the Church to Linus . . . and now Elutherius holds the episcopate in the twelfth place from the Apostles. By this same order, and by this same succession, both that tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is a most full demonstration that it is one and the same life-giving faith which is preserved in the Church from the Apostles and handed down in truth" (iii., sec. 3).

"The heavenly gift (of faith) has been confided to the Church as a principle of life for all her members . . . In her is accomplished all that operation of the Holy Spirit, in which they have no part, who, instead of being in communion with the Church, exclude themselves from life by their bad doctrines and criminal conduct. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and with her all grace" (iii., sec. 24).

Protestant writers have made very singular work in their attempts to elude the force of the declarations of St. Irenæus, which are so fatal to their cause. On the one hand they have made very singular concessions, and on the other very singular efforts to minimize and turn aside the clear and incisive statements which seem like an anticipated polemic against modern heresies. As an instance of Protestant concession, I quote Ziegler, who (in his work "Irenæus Bischof von Lyon," Berlin, 1871), says:

"To the mind of Irenæus it is the episcopate which sanctions the rule of faith, not *vice versa*. With him, as with Cyprian, the highest ecclesiastical office is inseparable from orthodox doctrine. . . . He makes the preservation of tradition, and the presence of the Holy Ghost with the Church, dependent upon the bishops, who in legitimate succession represent the Apostles, and . . . this manifestly because he wants at any price to have a guarantee for

the unity of the visible Church. This striving after unity appears in the most striking way in that passage where *he passes as if, in a prophetic spirit, beyond himself, and anticipates the Papal Church of the future.*"

No! he does not anticipate but describes the Papal Church as a present reality from St. Peter to St. Elutherius.

St. Irenæus is not a theorizer, an innovator. He is not an isolated teacher, setting forth a private, personal doctrine. He is the spokesman of the whole Church, in East and West, of his own time, the interpreter of tradition, the representative of St. Polycarp and St. John the Apostle, of the Christianity of the immediate disciples and successors of the Apostles. This is what Protestants have to face: The fact of the unanimous consent of the widely diffused Church of the beginning of the second century, in the Catholic tradition as having been received from the Apostles.

There is no way for Protestants to escape the dilemma, and remain Protestants, but to fall back on pure rationalism and give up altogether the Gospel which some of them hold so dear and cling to so tenaciously. Abandon these early witnesses to Catholicism, and reject their tradition of the Church, and you have lost at the same time the principal evidence of the Gospel, and all that which those who call themselves evangelical and orthodox Protestants regard as the very essence of the religion of Christ.

Dr. Fisher, one of the brightest ornaments of Yale University, and not surpassed by any Protestant scholar in this country, refers to St. Irenæus as an unimpeachable witness to the authenticity of the Gospel of St. John.

"Irenæus, a man of unquestioned probity, bishop of Lyons in the latter part of the second century, by whom, as by all his contemporaries, the fourth Gospel was received without doubt or question, had personally known in the East the martyr Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and had heard him describe the manners and appearance of the Apostle John, whom Polycarp had personally known at Ephesus where the Apostle spent his closing years. It is morally impossible that Irenæus received a Gospel as from John which Polycarp knew nothing of, or that Polycarp could have been mistaken in a point like this." (Art. "The Christian Religion," *N. A. Review*, February, 1882.)

Exactly for the same reason, Irenæus and his contemporaries could not have been mistaken about the whole ecclesiastical tradition of the hierarchy, the Roman primacy, the entire system of Catholic doctrine and discipline universally received as apostolic in the second century.

Dr. Fisher, in the same article just quoted, says: "Christianity existed and was complete, and it was preached, before a syllable

of the New Testament was written." What this complete Christianity, everywhere preached, really was, we know with certainty from the testimony of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian; to which might be added many other testimonies from various parts of the Church. The creed is a part of this tradition, and the New Testament is a part of it, though the entire canon did not receive full sanction until a later period, and the value of this sanction depends entirely on the infallible authority of the Church, which is antecedent to all dogmatic teaching, and underlies the whole fabric of Christian doctrine.

This infallible authority lodged in the Catholic episcopate as the continuation of the apostolate, is sufficiently established by the testimony of St. Irenæus. The bishops universally claim to be the successors of the Apostles in their sacerdotal teaching, governing, and judicial office, and this claim is unquestioned in the Catholic Church; is resisted only by heretics and schismatics, who made separate sects, all of which melted away and perished from the face of Christendom.

The testimony of St. Irenæus is corroborated by that of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and martyr. He was born near the time of the closing scenes of the life of our Lord, lived through the apostolic age, was a disciple of St. John and St. Peter, and was constituted by apostolic authority Bishop of Antioch, succeeding St. Evodius, who was the immediate successor of St. Peter in that see. He was martyred at Rome under Trajan, A. D. 107 or 116. He is, therefore, a most competent authority in regard to the constitution of the Church in the first century, and to all the ordinances of the Apostles. His epistles, written during his journey as a prisoner from Antioch to Rome, are full of testimonies to the episcopal constitution of the Christian hierarchy. He writes to the Ephesians:

"The bishops, constituted throughout the regions of the earth, are in the mind of Christ. Whence it becomes you to agree to the mind of the bishop, which you indeed do. For your honorable presbytery, worthy of God, is joined to the bishop as the strings to a harp."

To the Trallians:

"Let all likewise reverence the deacons as the commandment of Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the senate of God and the council of the Apostles. Without these, no assembly is called a Church."

These two passages prove the universality of the triple constitution of the Christian hierarchy as constituted by apostolic and divine authority, against all pretexts of variety in the order of different churches, and of a growth of episcopacy from an earlier Presbyterian order. To the Philadelphians:

"As many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop. . . . Therefore, be heedful to frequent one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice in the oneness of His blood, and one altar, as there is one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons.

When St. Ignatius writes to the Romans, there is a marked difference in his tone and language, which manifests the deep reverence with which he regarded the Roman Church, as holding the place of supreme pre-eminence among all the churches of Christendom.

"Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to the Church which has obtained mercy in the magnificence of the Most High Father and of Jesus Christ His only Son; the Church beloved and enlightened by the will of Him who wills all things, which are according to the love of Jesus Christ our God, which also presides in the place of the region of the Romans. . . . presiding over the love (*i.e.*, the universal Church united by the bond of love), bearing the name of Christ and the Father."

Thus the second century gives its testimony to the organic unity of the Catholic Church founded on its episcopal hierarchy. This testimony goes back into the first century, and to the Apostles St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John, the founders of the churches of Rome, Antioch, Ephesus, and Smyrna, through their immediate disciples St. Polycarp and St. Ignatius, from whom St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian receive and hand over to the succeeding age the pure apostolic tradition.

There is but one way by which Protestants seek to evade the conclusion that the hierarchical order of the Catholic Church was established by the Apostles under the direction of Jesus Christ. Its existence in the second century is a fact which must be accounted for. What was its origin if it were not of apostolic institution? It is assumed that it was a development, an evolution, or a transformation, which was silently effected during the obscure period which elapsed between the end of the apostolic ministry of St. Peter, St. Paul, and the other Apostles with the exception of St. John, and the age of St. Ignatius and St. Irenæus. Those who call themselves orthodox and evangelical Christians, and who therefore have an ideal of a certain positive, primitive Christian religion of which their Reformed Christianity is a reproduction, look upon the original Christian Church as a collection of single congregations under the presidency of one or more elders, holding fellowship with one another. These elders or presbyters, where in larger congregations they were associate pastors, naturally gave an honorary precedence to one of their number as their presiding elder. Thus in the clergy there were pastors or rectors,

who either stood alone as chiefs of smaller congregations, or who had associate ministers united with them in a sort of presbytery. These chief or presiding presbyters, gradually gaining a greater pre-eminence over the others, became the bishops of the second century. Likewise, the fellowship of churches grew into a stricter and more formal confederation, which in the process of time developed into diocesan, provincial and more general complexes, all embraced in one œcumenical society or Catholic Church. The fundamental ideas of this plan are, the essential independence of distinct churches, and the essential equality of all ministers of the Gospel of Christ. Subordination of churches and of pastors, ecclesiastical order and organization, according to this scheme, have a voluntary origin, are ecclesiastical arrangements established by purely human authority.

The evidence of the episcopal constitution of the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Asia Minor, in the first century, is sought to be evaded by the plea of a varied and unequal process of transition from presbyterian to episcopal government in different parts of the Church universal. This is purely theoretical, and rests only on negative arguments which take advantage of the scanty records, and the ambiguous terms used to designate the offices of the Christian ministry, in the period preceding that in which St. Ignatius and St. Irenæus flourished. The beginnings of Christianity were of course like those of all great buildings. The foundations were laid by missionaries, who did a preparatory work by converting, baptizing, and gathering together their disciples under such provisional and inchoate conditions as were immediately necessary and possible. The transition from a missionary to a regular and complete organization of the Church, from a provisional to a permanent government under local pastors, the formation of dioceses or parishes, of provinces and patriarchates, the determination of what may be called the elementary canon law, was necessarily a work of time. The ecclesiastical terminology became settled by degrees in the same way, not by formal enactments but by usage. The disciples of the Apostles were first called Christians at Antioch, and the name became imperceptibly common and universal. So with the term Catholic Church, and the names of bishop and presbyter in a distinctive sense; so too with the terms sacrament, Trinity, and many other dogmatic, ritual, or disciplinary formulas expressive of sacred things in the new religion, which became consecrated by usage. This is as much as to say that there was a development in the distinct, formal expression of the dogmas of faith, in the ecclesiastical organization, in the terminology which fixed the names of new things brought into existence by Christianity. The obscurity which

hangs over the earliest stage of this development of Christianity from its beginnings, on account of the scarcity of historical documents, furnishes the opportunity for ecclesiastical Darwinism to sport its hypothesis of the evolution of the historical Christianity of the second century from a different specific form in the first, and from a primitive protoplasm like that which Strauss, Renan and Harnack have imagined its original germ to have been.

In the instance of the episcopate, which we have made the pivot of our whole discussion, the evangelical Protestants who make it a transformation of Presbyterian regimen start from their own idea of the Christian Church and ministry. A church is a mere congregation of individual Christians. A pastor is the presiding officer and teacher of this congregation, most properly called an elder. If he has one or more associates, he is a chief elder, or they are equal colleagues. The theory is that in the first century churches, having several presbyters as colleagues, came to be under the special oversight of one presiding officer in the presbytery and the congregation. The division of an original parish into several, and the colonizing of country congregations from cities and towns, gave rise to dioceses over which the pastor of the mother church retained a superintendence, and among these dioceses the oldest or otherwise most important had a certain honorary precedence, as did also their bishops. In this theory the differential note of episcopacy is the diocesan, as distinguished from the parochial organization. A bishop is superior to a presbyter only as the president of several distinct congregations with their local pastors. There is no intrinsic difference between the bishop and the presbyter, or between the minister and the layman. The office is one of external appointment only, and ordination merely a decent ceremony, like installation, inthronization, or any other form of testifying the legality of the appointment to office, having no sacramental efficiency and conferring no supernatural grace and power on the recipient. Even on this low view of the Church and the ministry, the hypothesis of a universal, rapid, and quiet change from a loose organization of churches under mere elders, all equal in office, to a strict and complex polity and a subordination of clergy and laity to the authority of a monarchical episcopate, would have been morally impossible.

But, in point of fact, there is much more involved than a mere matter of external organization. In the question of the origin and development of the Catholic episcopate, the process of the formation of dioceses and provinces, and the determination of the precise relations between bishops and presbyters in their administrative functions, is not the main and essential point. The great underlying basis of the Catholic doctrine of apostolic succession

in the episcopate is the idea of the unity and sacramental character of the Church as the fountain of sacramental grace, from which, through special sacraments having an operative efficacy, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are communicated to individual members of the Church. This sacramental unity, by its organic type and principles, demands a true priesthood endowed with supernatural powers in the Church, and a hierarchical order which secures its unity and perpetuity. The episcopate of the second century claimed, with the unanimous consent of the faithful, to have received from the Apostles a true pontificate, the fulness of sacerdotal dignity and power, in which the presbyters had a secondary share. This is the pivot on which the whole discussion turns. The essential point is, that the Apostles received a true priesthood from the High Priest, Jesus Christ, which they had authority and commandment from Him to transmit to their successors. The nature of this sacerdotal office has been already explained, and also that of the pontifical office or the high priesthood, which is exclusively confined to bishops. It is evident that the priestly character, being sacramental and giving power over the real Body of Christ, as well as over His mystical body, can only be conferred by an authority received from Jesus Christ through the Apostles. The universal tradition in the Church from the beginning ascribes this authority, not to mere presbyters, but to a superior order of bishops, who have received a separate and higher consecration. Herein is the idea and the necessity of apostolic succession, viz., that the Apostles committed the custody of the faith and the sacraments, the transmission of the priesthood, the power of the keys, and the office of ruling and judging to the Catholic episcopate. We have seen that the great writers of the second century had no conception of any other form of Christianity but this, and that all Christians recognized it as apostolic, Gnostics, Marcionites, Montanists, and other heretics only excepted. The hypothesis of a change from a presbyterian to an episcopal order involves, therefore, the notion of a radical alteration in the whole idea of the Christian Church and ministry, and of the Christian religion in many doctrinal and practical respects. This radical alteration must also, if the aforesaid hypothesis is logically and consistently carried out, be made to include all the fundamental articles of the distinctively Christian creed. There is no middle ground between the position of Catholics and that of pure rationalists. M. Renan may be taken as the spokesman of rationalists, in respect to the supposed change from primitive Christianity to Catholicism, in the first century and a half of the existence of the religion of Christ and the Apostles. In his "*Marc Aurèle*," he thus sums up the results of his historical criticism :

"We may say that the organization of the churches experienced five degrees of progress, four of which were passed over during the period included in the present work. First, the primitive *ecclesia*, in which all its members are equally inspired by the Spirit. Then the ancients, or *presbyteri*, assume a considerable right of control and absorb the *ecclesia*. Next, the president of the ancients, the *episcopus*, absorbs almost all the powers of the ancients, and, consequently, those of the *ecclesia*. Afterwards, the *episcopi* of the different churches, by a mutual correspondence, form the Catholic Church. Among the *episcopi* there is one, he of Rome, who is evidently destined to a great future. The Pope, the Church of Jesus transformed into a monarchy, with Rome as a capital, appear in the dim distance. . . . At the end of the second century the episcopate is entirely ripe, the papacy exists in germ" (p. 416).

M. Renan attempts to trace also a parallel development, or rather evolution of the most fundamental dogmas of Catholic faith, the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the resurrection, etc., which, in the year 180, had reached such a stage of progress, that at this epoch he says :

"The Christian doctrine is already such a compact whole that nothing more can be added henceforth, and that any considerable alteration is no longer possible" (*Ibid.*, p. 507).

The Catholic dogmatic faith is a complete whole; the Catholic hierarchical organization is a complete whole. The two are indissolubly compacted together in one great whole, in full-orbed Catholicism, apostolic and Roman, at the end of the second century. The sacramental and sacerdotal elements are as closely combined with the other elements of orthodox Christianity as the single substances are combined in a chemical composite. As the subtraction of oxygen or hydrogen from water destroys the substance of water, so the subtraction of one element from Catholic Christianity destroys its essence.

When, how and by whom was the combination made? We find it existing at the end, in the middle, at the beginning of the second century; at the end of the first century, with the sanction of the Apostle St. John. The hypothesis of a change during the time which elapsed between the close of the apostolical ministry of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the close of the ministry of St. John, cannot be restricted to the limit of a mere external polity. The hierarchical polity is indissolubly connected with the essential principles of the sacramental and sacerdotal constitution of the Church, of the rule of faith, of Catholic unity, dogmatic and organic. Either the entire Catholicism came from the Apostles as the ministering agents and instruments of Christ, or there is no authentic canon of the New Testament, no authentic preaching of the divinity of Christ,

no supernatural Christian religion at all. This is a *reductio ad absurdum*.

The foundation and triumph of historical Christianity is a phenomenon without a parallel in the history of the world. It demands a cause, and an adequate cause. That it should have sprung up suddenly out of the ground, without any root in the teaching of Christ and the Apostles, leaving no trace of its beginnings and progress within thirty or fifty years from A. D. 70, and have become complete within another thirty or fifty years, is incredible and inconceivable. Such a hypothesis is like the foolish fancy that the universe came into being by chance. The only reasonable cause which can be assigned is the divine wisdom and power of Jesus Christ, who founded the Catholic Church and gave instructions and the Holy Spirit to the Apostles; who continued His work and provided for its extension and perpetuity in the institution of the episcopate centred and consolidated in the primacy of the successors of St. Peter. This Church of Christ, one, holy, Catholic and apostolic, is its own proof. Its existence proves its divine origin, and itself is the most brilliant and conclusive proof of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

[NOTE.—In the foregoing article the date A. D. 200, assigned to various events, is not to be taken as precisely accurate, but as standing for the closing period of the second century ending with that year. Many additional proofs of Catholic doctrine and discipline might be cited from the second century and the end of the first, which had to be omitted for want of space. I may be permitted to refer to many articles which I have published in the back volumes of the *Catholic World*, in which several topics of the present article are more fully treated and discussed.—A. F. H.]

THE ANGLICAN THEORY OF CONTINUITY.

THE Church of England is the most important of the Protestant sects. As a religion, it has very little influence; but as a State-made institution of one of the great political powers, it counts for something in most of the nations of the earth. We need therefore make no apology for the discussion of a theory which has found favor with the High Church party in Great Britain and which is the very back-bone of the contention of the Ritualists: "The Continuity of Catholicity in the Church of England."

The theory may be briefly stated in this way. The Ritualists having approached as nearly to the Catholic Church as they could manage to do without submitting to her authority, have been driven into this corner, that they have had to substitute a past authority for an authority which is living and which is present. This past authority is, or was, the early Church; and the Ritualists affirm that they are in agreement with this past authority, and are therefore in communion with the Catholic Church. In other words, the Church in England, during the first few centuries, being assumed by Ritualists to have been *not* Roman Catholic; and the Church of England in this present day being *not* Roman Catholic, it must follow, argue the Ritualists, that the Church of England and the early Church must be necessarily one and the same Catholic Church. This theory is called the theory of continuity, or the theory of the continuousness of the early Church. It will be observed that Roman Catholics, in England, are on this theory, schismatics and heretics; they are indeed, as it were, simply Protestants; the Archbishop of Canterbury being the true Supreme Pontiff, and Pope Leo XIII., an intruder.

Now, to vindicate their theory it will be necessary for the Ritualists to establish the three following facts: that (1) the government; (2) the doctrines; and (3) the ritual of the Church in England, during the earlier or pre-middle age period, were identical with (1) the government; (2) the doctrines, and (3) the ritual of the Church of England as by law established at this present day.

More than this, the Ritualists must prove that the English religion of the Middle Ages was identical with the post-Reformation religion; for, that the religion of the Middle Ages should be one religion, and the post-Reformation religion another religion, would be a breach in continuity which would be fatal to the theory that "there has been no breach in the English Catholic religion." This

last point is quite as important as are the other three points. If it can be shown that the Catholic religion in England, from, say the sixth to the sixteenth century (one thousand years) was *not* identical with the religion of the Ritualists—not identical in government, in doctrine, in ritual,—then away goes the theory of continuity; because a chasm of a thousand years would have to be leaped over, in order to reach across to the Catholic Church of the early centuries. No man would gravely argue that continuity could mean a rupture of fully one thousand years in Catholic communion, any more than he could gravely argue that a gold watch guard, of which ten out of nineteen links had been broken away, was one continuous gold watch guard of nineteen links. And if the strength of a chain be the strength of its weakest link, the strength of a chain of which ten links were wanting—and these ten links lost from the middle of the chain—would be the strength of, say, no chain at all.

We first take up the assumption that the early Church in England was identical in government, in doctrine, in ritual, with the Church of England of the year 1892.

I.

As to the government of the early Church we assert that it was identical with the government of the Catholic Church in the present day, the Bishop of Rome being the recognized Pontiff, so that all bishops received their jurisdiction from him. Will not Dr. Döllinger be accepted by our Anglican friends as a good authority in such a matter of history? In his volume on “The First Age of Christianity and the Church,” when commenting on the divine origin of the Primacy, he says, “Christ gave to Peter four closely allied promises of future power and pre-eminence in the Church: (1) he should be the rock whereon Christ should build it; (2) the Church built on him should never fail; (3) Christ would give him the keys of His kingdom or Church; (4) what he bound or loosed on earth should be bound or loosed in heaven.” And in his “History of the Church,” Dr. Döllinger says: “That the decrees of synods concerning faith obtained their full force and authority only by being received and confirmed by the Pope, was publicly acknowledged in the fourth century.” He adds, in regard to the early general councils: “The Fifth General Council held in 381, which was a council of only Oriental bishops, acquired the authority of an Œcumenical Council by the subsequent acceptance and confirmation of the Pope, St. Augustine declaring after the two African synods had been confirmed by the Pontiff, ‘*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*!’” So again the Council of Ephesus, in forming its judgment against Nestorius, said that it did so follow-

ing the canons and the epistle of the Pope. The same council also ratified, without any further examination the Papal condemnation of Pelagianism. At Chalcedon the council in drawing up its dictum on the point of the controversy, did not appeal to the synod which had been held at Constantinople, under Flavian, but only to the decree of the Pontiff. In the judgment upon Eutyches, Cecropius, Bishop of Sabaste, declared in the name of all his brethren, that the Bishop of Rome had sent to them a formulary, and that they all followed him and subscribed to his epistle. The Sixth General Council in like manner declared that it adhered to the dogmatic epistle of the Pope Agatho, and by it condemned the heresy." And then, adds Dr. Döllinger, as a commentary on the fact that the whole of the early Church throughout the world was Roman Catholic: "It was acknowledged to be the prerogative of the first see in the Christian world that the Bishop of Rome could be judged by no man. It was a thing unheard of that the head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects. He who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not truly in the Catholic Church."

But perhaps Anglicans will reply that Dr. Döllinger was a German; he could not enter into the spirit of "Theophilus Anglicanus." Besides, a few years after writing his "History," Dr. Döllinger discovered that all his readings of history had been wrong, and he acted in a manner which he had affirmed in his "History" was "a thing unheard of in the early Church." Moreover, the Ritualists are fond of arguing in this way: "Britain was independent of Rome in the earlier times, whatever may have been the case with other countries. It was not till the Mission of Augustine that the Pope obtained any power over Britain." Now we have to affirm in reply, that there were Roman Catholics in England before the date of what is called the "Augustine Mission." We have to remember that England was imperially a Roman colony, long before it became ecclesiastically Roman Catholic. The whole of England was dotted with Roman towns; richly sprinkled with the works of Roman engineers; a Roman census and a Roman poll tax were levied; and, what is more to the point, Roman Christians filled places in the army, and also in some departments of the State before the time when Pope Eleutherius, in the second century, sent missionaries to the Catholic Christians then in England; missionaries who spoke the Roman tongue to the Roman Christians, who were then numerous, though scattered, throughout Britain; missionaries who, by the authority of the Holy See, firmly planted their own authority in England; so that, a little later, the English Bishops who were present at the Council of Arles (and this too in the early part of

fourth century) had Roman names and were Bishops of Roman towns: Prestitutus, Bishop of London, Adelphinus, Bishop of a colony of London, and Eborius, Bishop of York, the Roman Capital. Before the time of the Council of Nice, all these Bishops, in common with Bishops of Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Africa, had signed a synodal letter to Pope St. Sylvester, submitting to him certain disciplinal decisions. Long before the Roman imperial forces left Britain, bishops of Roman blood and Roman name had been sent to the Picts and the Irish by the Roman pontiffs (such names as Patricius and Palladius speak for themselves). And the very titles, clerical and Catholic, still in use in the Church of England, prove how solely Roman was their origin: Archbishop, precentor, canon, parson, chancellor; as also such words as Sacrament, cathedral, Testament, Bible, telling the tale of Roman origin and Catholic paternity. As the *Guardian* newspaper (that most respectable of Church of England organs) said on February 8, 1889: "It cannot be said too often the Roman planted, the Scot watered, the Briton did nothing. Mind, it is no kind of blame to the Briton that he did nothing, but as a matter of fact he did nothing. The Scot did a good deal, but he did nothing till the Roman had begun, and his work may be looked on as merged in that of the Roman. Make what theological inferences we choose . . . the Church of England is, above all other Churches of Europe, the child of the Church of Rome." It seems probable that it was to the Apostle St. Peter that Britain owed her primitive Christianity; and, if this were so, the Church government in Britain would be absolutely and exclusively Roman Catholic. How precise is that statement in the ancient Syriac documents, discovered by the late Dr. Cureton in the Nitrian monastery in Lower Egypt, and now kept in the British Museum: "The City of Rome, and all Italy, and Spain, and Britain, and Gaul, received the Apostle's Hand of Priesthood from Simon Cephas, who went up from Antioch." This Syriac witness assures us that, at some time between A.D. 42-67, a disciple of St. Peter tried to evangelize Britain. It is true that there was little harvest from that first sowing; yet from the fact that Pope Eleutherius, in the second century, received a letter from Lucius, King of Britain, asking that "he might be made a Christian by his orders," we can infer that there was an early, incipient Catholic Church. Venerable Bede tells this incident of King Lucius, not once but many times in his history; it is found also in the Book of Llandaff, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in the Martyrology of St. Ado of Vienne, and was universally accepted by all authorities. Gildas, the historian, who believes that Christianity began to make its appearance in Britain before the year A.D. 61, is also of opinion that it

did not make much progress till the persecution of Diocletian, A.D. 303. Venerable Bede, however, asserts that the Britons, having received the Faith, kept it whole and undefiled, and in peace and quiet till the time of Diocletian the Emperor." And certainly the statement of St. Irenæus (A.D. 178) that "The whole Church has one and the same faith throughout the whole world," must mean that a unity which was impossible without headship was preserved by obedience to God's Vicar. In so brief a space as this single article may afford us, we must rather argue inferentially than historically. And of the inferential class of arguments, there is no safer rule than this: that an effect must be always derived from sufficient cause. Now an "effect" which the earliest writers always insisted on—which saints and doctors always asserted to be manifest—was the oneness of the whole Christian, Catholic family; and this oneness could only be secured by a common government; by one and the same divine, infallible authority. In the earliest centuries we find such testimonies as the following to the fact and to the obligation of Catholic oneness. St. Cyprian, about A.D. 250, spoke of "the Church which is Catholic and one, which is not rent nor divided." St. Cyril, about A.D. 347, advised travellers to "ask for the Catholic Church; for this is the peculiar name of this holy body, the mother of us all." St. Pacian called the Church "everywhere one"; and St. Hilary, "one, not by a confusion of bodies." St. Augustine, about A.D. 390, said "we are joined to the churches beyond the seas"; and St. Irenæus, A.D. 178, as before quoted, affirmed, "the whole Church has one and the same faith throughout the whole world." Now it is evident that such a unity would have been a natural impossibility—just as it is now seen to be a natural impossibility—save on the hypothesis of one common, divine government. The unity of the Visible Body came from its union with the Visible Head. The fact of a universal accord in matters of faith, which was equally testified to and enjoined by the early saints, necessarily involved one common, supreme authority, just as, conversely, we see Protestantism necessarily shivered into countless sects, because its only authority is that of individual, private judgment; in other words, it has no authority at all.

We may trace this divine unity of church government in the Catholic doctrine of the very earliest Christian times, almost as well as we can trace it in the historic proofs of personal rule, or in the exhortations to oneness by primitive saints. What are doctrines, but spiritual certainties for the human intellect, deriving their whole security from infallibility? Now the doctrines of the Church of England of the present day—or, for that matter, of the Church of England of the last three centuries—are no more like

the doctrines of the early English Church, than the pious vagaries of the Salvation Army are like the theology of an old-fashioned rector of some Anglican country parish of fifty years ago. The first sham pontiff of the English Church, Henry VIII., in his book on the Seven Sacraments (five of which sacraments his daughter Elizabeth obliterated) was careful to inform the heresiarch, Luther, that "the Church in England had from the first centuries believed all Roman doctrine"; and he added, "it cannot be denied that the whole church of the faithful recognizes the Holy Roman See as its mother and chief." Sir Thomas More, whom Henry VIII. put to death for insisting on this very same Catholic truth, was only one of a great army of witnesses to the whole Catholic faith of the English people. And at this point it may be observed that it is a favorite delusion of modern Anglicans, that they, and they alone, know what was the faith of the English people, and that the pre-reformation Catholics were misinformed. Yet we may suppose that a man like Sir Thomas More, a learned chancellor, an accomplished scholar, and a saint, was not likely to have offered his head to Henry's spite, unless he knew that the Papal supremacy was of faith. And so too we may express the conviction that the Council of Trent (1546) was at least as good a judge of what was "primitive Christianity," what was the faith once delivered to the saints, as a crowd of hungry courtiers or worldly apostates, who did not know their own minds for two days together, and were continually reviling each other's creeds. It may be taken for granted that More and Fisher, who died for their religion, knew better what was early English Christianity than the Ritualistic clergy of 1892. They knew, for example—just to hint at a few facts—that the Anglo-Saxon believed in the Mass and Transubstantiation; said Masses for the dead, and sang hymns to our Blessed Lady; placed the relics of the martyrs under their altars, and a crucifix above them; and enjoined celibacy on their sacrificing priests. They knew that the British customs, like the British faith, had from the first, been grounded on the teaching of the Holy See; that in the fourth century, British bishops wrote to Pope St. Sylvester, to ask for a confirmation of synodal acts; British bishops being also present at the Council of Arles, which council confessed to the pope's headship; while to the Council of Sardica a synodal letter was despatched, and letters to Pope St. Julius I., in which were the words, "It will be seen the best, and by far the most suitable arrangement, that the priests of the Lord, from every single province, report to the Head, that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter." They knew that on the Feast of St. Peter's Chair, a Mass Collect was said in early times, beginning with, "O God, who on this day didst give us Blessed Peter, Head of the Church after Thyself."

They knew that appeals had been made to Rome, from the earliest times, on points of faith, discipline, jurisdiction; that the pallium had been always the symbol of the pope's supremacy, and that without it no archbishop had jurisdiction; they knew (for these were the words of Bishop Fisher) that "the Church *alone* which has descended from Peter, has obtained the name of Catholic." They knew that the teaching of the English universities had, from the first, been always submissive to the Holy See; that every archbishop had always promised on his knees before the altar, to be "faithful and obedient to the Holy Apostolic Roman Church, and my Lord Pope"; and that even the constitutional law of England had laid it down that "To the pope and the priesthood belong spiritual things; to the king and the kingdom those that are temporal." And, if it be answered by the Ritualists, "But you do not here show that all doctrines were identical in England and in Rome; you speak rather of submission to papal government than of the adoption of the Roman faith and practice"; the answer is that to submit to papal government, and to cling faithfully to Roman faith and practice, were *necessarily* one and the same thing. For, though it be difficult for a modern Anglican to comprehend it, the Catholic faith, which rests on obedience in unity, is necessarily and essentially one in dogma; cannot be diverse, nor in the faintest degree opinionative, because it is the infused truth of the intellect of the Most High. To this subject we will refer again as we go on; suffice it for the answer to say that the doctrines of the Catholic Church were the assured certainties of the teachings of infallibility; so that to admit the infallible decisions of the Holy See is to admit and to know all Catholic truth; to be one in obedience and in belief. And since that admission, that obedience, was common to all Catholics of all ages, it necessarily follows that the early Church was one with the present Church in all matters of faith, reverence, devotion.

As was the first government, the first creed, so was the first ritual of the Catholic Church. The Roman liturgy used in England for nine hundred years, brought by Augustine from Pope Gregory the First, indicates, beyond the possibility of question, the nature of the service in which it is used; determines its character to be sacrificial, and proves that before the time of St. Augustine the ritual of the Church must have been Roman Catholic. St. Augustine offered up the Holy Mass in England, not in the English language, but in the Latin language; he invoked the saints, he venerated the cross, he wore the Catholic robes, he did all and he taught all that was Roman, and as it continues to be Roman to the present day. Now it suffices to say that the Christianity of the early centuries must have been faithfully graven on

that liturgy which St. Gregory used; for to suppose that the Popes within four or five hundred years, had so completely changed and "corrupted" Christianity as to render it no longer St. Peter's religion, is to suppose an absurdity which, in the natural order, would be monstrous, and in the supernatural order an impossibility. Let us keep to the one fact. The Roman liturgy in the time of St. Augustine (and as it came to be used in the Catholic Church in England) was from end to end what Protestants would call "rank popery." This is all we want. If in so very short a time the living Church of the living God, under the special guidance of the successors of St. Peter, could have fallen into abominable idolatry, then there can be no Church at all, and Christianity is all as human as was the authority of Queen Elizabeth, or as is the authority of the present English Privy Council. We shall see the force of this truth as we go on. For the moment let us say that the ritual of the first centuries, like the doctrines, and like the government of the first centuries, was no more like the ritual of the Church of England, than light is like darkness, or substance is like shadow, or the youth of vigorous life is like death. Continuity in the Church of England is about as tenable a theory as the derivation of chaos from creation.

II.

There is no need to speak of continuity through the Middle Ages; the Church of England has kindly settled that question for us. "The Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," says the Thirty-first Article of the Anglican Church. So also we are informed on the same authority that five out of the seven Christian sacraments have "grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles." Extreme unction, we know, has disappeared altogether out of the teaching of the institution which is declared "continuous." Penance has been never mentioned for three centuries, except to be either ridiculed or reviled; Orders have been divested of every symbol of the ancient Ordinals (the anointing the hands with the consecrated chrism; the delivery of the chalice and paten to the newly ordained; the celebration, conjointly with the consecrating prelate, of the Adorable Sacrifice), so as to obliterate the idea of priesthood from the Church of England; and finally, as though to annihilate continuity, by one diabolical sweep of all Catholicism—the Anglican homily on "Peril of Idolatry" affirms that "for the space of eight hundred years and more" (which would be from about the seventh century to the sixteenth) "laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages,

sects, and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendom were drowned in abominable idolatry." Here we have not even a loophole left for continuity. The whole of the Middle Ages was Roman Catholic, and Roman Catholicism was abominable idolatry. So that either the Church of England has no more continuity from the Middle Ages than it has continuity from the religion of the Shah of Persia; or else it has the same religion as that of the Middle Ages; in which case it is abominable idolatry.

But we all know the shifts by which it is sought to be established that two obviously opposite principles may be identical. One of these shifts with our Angelical friends is to affirm that the papal power was "a growth of the ambition of the Roman pontiffs; the Church in England in the earlier centuries being independent of Rome, and even resenting all pontifical interference." Now, there is nothing like the testimony of an adversary. We have already quoted Dr. Döllinger as affirming that it was "a thing unheard of in the earlier centuries that the Head of the Church should be judged by his own subjects; he who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not in the Catholic Church"; and we have, too, referred to the testimony of Henry VIII., in his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, addressed to Luther. This last production is so exceedingly valuable as a publication intended to be read by all Christendom, that we may venture to quote it once more. The king's reasoning in regard to "the growth of the ambition of the Roman pontiffs" is perhaps as plain an answer to the Anglican delusion as was ever penned by any Catholic in any country. He says: "If the Pope has obtained this wide and greatly extended power neither by the command of God nor the will of man, but has seized it by force, I fain would know of Luther when he rushed into so great a territory? The origin of such immense power cannot be obscure, especially if it began in the memory of man. But should he say that it is not older than one or two centuries, let him point out the fact from histories; otherwise, if it be so ancient that the origin of so great a power is obliterated, let him know that it is allowed by the laws that he whose right ascends so far beyond the memory of man that its origin cannot be traced, had a lawful beginning; and that it is forbidden by the consent of all nations to move those things which have been for a long time unmoved." And continuing in the same vein of common sense, Henry VIII. says: "When Luther so impudently asserts, and this against his former declaration, that the Pope has no kind of power over the Catholic Church; no, not so much as human, but that he has by sheer force usurped the sovereignty, I greatly wonder how he should expect his readers to be either so credulous or so dull as to believe that a priest without any weapon

or company to defend him (as doubtless he was before he became possessed of that which Luther says he has usurped) could ever have hoped to gain, without any right or title, such empire over so many bishops, his equals, in so many different and distant nations; or that all people should believe that all kingdoms, cities and provinces had been so reckless of their own affairs, rights and liberties as to give to a strange priest an amount of power over them, such as he could not have dared to hope for." This puts the case very sensibly; and when Henry VIII. was made "Defender of the Faith" for so really creditable a defence of Catholic truth, he reached the summit of his respectability as man and king; and it is a pity that he did not then die and make an end of it. Subsequently, however, the charms of Anne Boleyn got the better of Henry's sense and good morals, so that the only "continuity" of the Catholic faith which he has left to "the Church of England by law established" is the empty title of "Defender of the Faith"; not defender of the Catholic faith, but of that curious muddle of Protestant negations which Queen Victoria swore at her coronation to uphold. Continuity is perhaps in no way better illustrated than in this inheritance of words without their sense. While on this subject we are reminded of a kindred example of continuity in the instance of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who charges his shield with the *Roman Pallium*, the symbol of Rome-conferred jurisdiction; thus acknowledging that jurisdiction comes from the Pope, while pleading guilty to not having got it. We are reminded, too, of the continuity of the word Catholic, as now claimed by the Ritualist party in the Church of England; a claim, in regard to which Mr. Labouchere recently remarked in *Truth*: "The Roman Catholic Church was known as the Catholic Church for many centuries. It has, therefore, the right to this 'trademark.' What people call themselves matters little; the important point is, what they are. For the Church of England to call itself the Catholic Church has always seemed to me as absurd as for the Hartington and Chamberlain gang of seceders to call themselves the Liberal Party." And once more, we are reminded of the continuity of sees, cathedrals, parish churches, names of saints, prayers, collects, gospels, epistles, and a countless array of what we must frankly call "stolen goods"; all testifying to the truth that England was Roman Catholic, and that "Roman" and "Catholic" meant the same thing. Continuity in all these cases is really the appropriating others' property and breaking it up so as to try to prevent identification; the very process of breaking it up proving, first, that it belonged to others, and next, that those others believed all Roman doctrine.

Appropriation by force is not continuity. When Henry VIII.

applied to Parliament (not to Convocation) to declare him virtually supreme head of the Church in England, in the spiritual as well as the temporal sense of headship, the bill was passed by a small majority under a reign of terror; numerous Catholics, including the saintly Fisher and the heroic and ever to be honored Sir Thomas More, suffering death rather than give their sanction to such impiety. As Macaulay says: "When the supremacy was transferred to King Henry VIII., of pious memory, and all things which by the canon law belonged to the Roman pontiff as Head of the Church were made over to him, he then became king and pope." But no sooner was this frightful sacrilege accomplished—this almost impossible mockery of divine truth and natural sense—than Henry VIII. passed by force the Statute of the Six Articles, declaring transubstantiation, communion under one kind, celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, the Sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead, and auricular confession to be included within the obligation of the English religion. Now, two things are most important to be here observed: first, that Henry VIII. dared not repudiate even one of these Six Articles, because he knew that all Christendom had always held them; and next, that the subsequent repudiation of those Six Articles by Queen Elizabeth cut off all continuity with the Catholic Church. The action of Henry VIII. in repudiating *only* the papal supremacy proved that he did this *only* because he wanted to marry Anne Boleyn; while the subsequent action of his daughter, Elizabeth, in instituting her terrible penal laws, and in cutting off all continuity with the Catholic Church, proves that she knew she could only reign by absolutely uprooting that divine religion, whose Visible Head had pronounced her to be illegitimate. Henry VIII.'s rebellion had been only schismatical; his heresy was an after-thought, if a prolific one; Elizabeth's rebellion was the forcing the whole nation into apostasy as the only means of securing her place upon the throne. As Macaulay says in his essays: "The chief actors in the Reform movement regarded the whole thing as a mere political job." Dr. Lee, the Anglican writer, says: "The queen did not in the least believe, though officially she was bound to do so, in her so-called supremacy. . . . She frankly avowed to Lausac, the French envoy, that circumstances " (meaning her illegitimacy) "had created a breach with the Pope, and that the English Parliament and people having resolved to make a *new* Church for themselves, she was obliged to assume and exercise the office of supreme governess of it." So far, however, had been the English people and the English Parliament from "resolving to make a new Church for themselves," that it was only by the queen's threats that Parliament had been compelled (and this, too, by a majority of three only) to pass the Act of Uniformity in apostasy.

And it was only by the institution of the most savage penal laws—quite as savage as the laws of the pagan emperors, but more continuous in their exercise or execution—that Catholic England was compelled to appear Protestant, while all the while loathing the new religion. Fines, imprisonment, banishment and hanging were the apostolic arguments of Queen Elizabeth while converting the nation from the old religion of fifteen centuries to a mixed Lutheranism, Calvinism and Zwinglism. Fearful became the penalties for saying Mass, and for *not* substituting the communion service, mocked as “May Game”; fearful became the penalties for *not* pulling down the old altars, so as to emphasize the extinction of the old priesthood, and for *not* substituting what the people called an “oyster table,” from which to administer Queen Elizabeth’s new sacrament. So that at one and the same time Catholic government was annihilated, Catholic doctrines were ridiculed or blasphemed, and the whole body of Catholic law, discipline and custom was removed out of the towns and parishes of England. Catholicity was wiped out with continuity. As to Christian unity, that went, of course, with Christian doctrine. As Archbishop Heath, the primate, said, in the House of Lords, when uniformity was being debated and resisted: “By relinquishing and forsaking the See of Rome, we must forsake and flee from these four things: (1) all General Councils; (2) all canonical and ecclesiastical laws of the Church of Christ; (3) the judgment of all other Christian princes; (4) and we must forsake and flee from the unity of the Christian Church; and by leaping out of Peter’s ship, hazard ourselves to be overwhelmed and drowned in the waters of schisms, sects and divisions.” Still, a majority of three passed uniformity, and Elizabethanism took the place of Catholicity.

Thus much might suffice for our present purpose, which is to dispose of the whole question of continuity. Our Anglican friends try to forget that the bishops imprisoned by Queen Elizabeth were still the only *Ecclesia Docens* in England; they alone retained the right of jurisdiction; and the mock bishops who took their places had no more authority than had Queen Elizabeth to teach, rule, command, or administer sacraments. These mock bishops, with one exception, were all Calvinists, opposed to everything that savored of Catholic episcopacy, and ridiculing “the Popish idea of Apostolic Succession.” Parker wrote to the Chief Secretary, Cecil, to ask “whether her Majesty *and you* will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered”; and, in order to provide against the inconvenience of having no true bishops, the Queen caused an act to be passed by parliament that, “the Queen shall collate or appoint bishops in bishoprics being vacant; and that, without rites or ceremonies”; that is without

episcopal consecration. No wonder that "Anglican Orders cannot be proved." In the first place, all the Catholic bishops holding office at the time refused to hand over the succession to Elizabeth's shams, so that no canonical succession was even possible; while, as for jurisdiction, that was hopelessly gone forever; and without jurisdiction where is authority? It was all very well to take four unfrocked, degraded friars, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, and tell them to consecrate a Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, "supplying all defects" by the supreme royal authority of Queen Elizabeth; but as Barlow was never a bishop, except by election; as there is no record of his having been consecrated; as he did not believe in the necessity of consecration, but thought the royal appointment quite sufficient; and as the form, moreover, used in consecrating Parker, was insufficient for the making of a bishop, we can dismiss Barlow as a link in the continuity. As to Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, not one of them was a provincial bishop in the sense of the fourth canon of the Council of Nice, and, not having any jurisdiction themselves, they could not confer it upon others; nor had any one of them been consecrated by the English Church, but only by Cranmer's invalid rite. As to Cranmer's ritual, it had been drawn up expressly to do away with priestly orders in the Church of England; the prayer of consecration, with the accompanying imposition of hands, being purposely omitted by its author. Thus, in matter, form, and intention, all such consecrations were invalid; and the continuity of orders in the Church of England has been ridiculed by all schismatical bodies; just as, after critical examination, it was pronounced by Pope Clement XI., in April, 1704, to be so utterly futile and worthless, that "all heretical ministers returning to the bosom of the Church must be treated as lay persons."

Nor did the immediate successors of these sham bishops believe in the validity of their orders. Thus, Whitaker, being reproached for his want of orders, replied, "keep your orders to yourselves"; Fulke, a sort of official Anglican controversialist, spoke of "stinking, greasy, anti-Christian, and execrable Orders"; while Grindal long refused to accept office, through his dislike of "the mummery of consecration." Shortly afterwards, Jewel wrote, "religion is everywhere changed"; and, in his "Apology," he ridiculed, as did Fulke and Whittaker, the notion that "succession" was necessary. So deeply did this Puritan spirit possess these "reformers," that within less than a century episcopacy went out of date, and nonconformism became the fashion of the country. Professedly Catholic, Calvinistic, Presbyterian, and Anglican, the Church of England went all round the compass within a century; nor was it till the reign of James I. that the clergy became so ashamed of

their orders that they "cooked" the Lambeth Register, so as to get rid of the Barlow difficulty; for which offence the king granted a general pardon. We may go so far, indeed, as to say that the present Church of England only came into existence in the year 1662, at which date its formularies were altered into their present shape, and ordained clergymen were requisitioned for the ministry. Nor does the law of England recognize the Establishment as identical with the Church of England; Parliament, in virtue of its *altum dominium*, having alienated every Catholic endowment from the objects for which it was bequeathed, so that, for example, the Catholic Mass cannot be said in the very chapels which were built and endowed for Catholic worship. Finally, Queen Victoria at her coronation had an oath administered to her, by the Primate of her own church, to "maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion, as by law established"; that is, the religion of 1662. The Throne, therefore, like the Parliament, like the Reformers, knows nothing of the religion of old England. Protestantism is the religion of Englishmen. Catholicity has its continuity in the Catholic Church; but the Church of England is no more Catholic than is Wesleyism or Quakerism; indeed in its hostility to the Catholic Church, it has been more schismatical, more Protestant, than any of the numerous sects it has begotten.

III.

We have, thus far, glanced chiefly at two periods: the early Church, and the fifty years of the Reformation. We have necessarily only "glanced," for, in so vast a subject, it is impossible to go critically into any single point which is in dispute. To begin with, the chief inquiry with every Anglican is, "What is the earliest known *kind* of Christianity?" the Anglican idea being that the Catholic Church is as changeful as is any purely human society or institution. They even *wish* it to be so. They instantly take the side which is opposed to Church unity; instinctively throw in their lot with rebellion. Thus, they are determined to prove that, when Augustine came to England, British Christians had already broken Catholic unity; and they feel a keen gratification in trying to show that "independence" was the key-note of early English Christianity. They will have it, that the British refused to keep Easter at the time which was approved by the Holy See; utterly ignoring the fact that the British *had* fixed their Easter, A. D. 453, in accordance with the then custom of Rome; utterly ignoring the fact that, A. D. 326, the Emperor Constantine certified that the same Easter was kept in the city of Rome and through all Italy, Africa, Egypt, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Lybia, and all Achaia"; and utterly ignoring the fact that the long bitterness of warfare between the two

racés, British and Saxon, naturally made the British reluctant to receive an emissary who came fresh from the Saxon headquarters, who asked them to bless and benefit their enemies, and who was the close friend of the Saxon, Ethelbert of Kent. Moreover, the question of Easter was not a question of dogma; it was a question of ecclesiastical uniformity; it was a question which was discussed in East and West for a period of more than two centuries; and when the time for keeping it was finally settled at Rome, no further opposition was attempted. A hundred and forty years before Augustine reached Kent, we find the decisive entry in the "Annales Cambriæ": "This year (A. D. 453) Easter is changed on Sunday, with Pope Leo, Bishop of Rome." The Catholic spirit which animated the British in 453 was not likely to have become Protestant in the sixth century.

The point, the one point, for Anglicans to consider, is that, when Augustine and his missionaries came to Canterbury, they found that the Roman Catholic religion had preceded them. They found at Canterbury, for example, an ancient Catholic Church, St. Martin's, and in this Church they "said Mass," as Bede records; they sang, prayed, preached, and baptized, and applied themselves to "frequent watching and fasting." In other words, they did everything that was Roman Catholic, and nothing that was Anglican or Protestant. Pope Gregory, who "bore the pontifical primacy all over the world," as Bede says, created Augustine Primate over all England. He sent Augustine the *pallium*, that is, he conferred upon him jurisdiction; and, writing to Augustine, the Pope said: "We give you no authority over the bishops of Gaul, because the Bishop of Arles received the *pallium* in ancient times from our predecessors; but as for all the bishops of Britain, we commit them to your care." Mark the words, "received the *pallium* in ancient times from our predecessors"; an assertion of long established supremacy which would have been an absurdity had it not been an historic fact. Just as it would have been an absurdity,—to go back to so early a date as only ten years after the martyrdom of St. Alban, and therefore to an early part of the fourth century,—for Eborius, Bishop of York, to sign a letter to Pope St. Sylvester, which letter was addressed to "The Most Beloved Pope Sylvester," and in which letter the various prelates used the words: "Bound together in one common bond of love and the oneness of our Mother, the Catholic Church, we salute thee, most glorious Pope, with the reverence due to thee"; unless all Christendom was then aware, and was duly impressed with the *historic* truth, that the Bishop of Rome was the Holy Father of the Catholic Church, and that, apart from him, there was a lifeless body without a head.

We must, however, go more fully into details so as to grasp the obedience of the whole of the Ages of Faith. We affirm, as the general principle, that the Popes always claimed plenitude of power, and that bishops, kings, and peoples always conceded it. The real history of the conversion of England to the faith began with the mission of St. Augustine; and, within a period of eighty years, by the united aid of Roman and Celtic missionaries, the whole country was gained over to the faith, and the Church of England was solidly built up. Henceforth the kings made all temporal arrangements, but the Pontiffs did the spiritual part. England, like all other countries, looked to the Popes as the foundation of jurisdiction, and also as the supreme judicial tribunal in regard to all ecclesiastical matters. And while this historic fact is indisputable, it is equally indisputable that the Popes regarded themselves as the bulwark of the independence of all bishops, a fact as obvious as that the modern Anglican bishops, and also the bishops of the Czar's Church, are the slaves of the State, of the civic power. It is desirable that we bear such facts in mind when measuring the ecclesiastical power in the Middle Ages. The very mention of such words as Appeals, Investitures, Prohibition, *Præmunire*, *Provisos*, and the like, recalls to us the constant *necessary* strife that went on between the Church and the world. The frontier-line, which divided the spiritual from the temporal, was *necessarily* always a subject of dispute between the Pontiffs and these worldly, selfish sovereigns. What was the office and the business of the Church except to protect the faith of peoples; to protect their liberties, in the full enjoyment of their religion, against the temporal ambition or mundane greed of this bad secular governor or of that? It is the fashion with Anglicans to talk of "Papal Usurpation," whereas the truth is that the usurpation was always monarchical, the usurpation by kings being both natural and easy, but by Pontiffs as unnatural as it was difficult. The frequent tricks of bad kings to get the better of the Pontiffs led to endless misunderstanding and scandal, and it is only by a close study of contemporary history that we get to see through the network of such controversies.

Brevity obliges us to allude only to a few examples of Papal prerogative, and of royal and episcopal admission of such prerogative. St. Gregory the Great claimed from Spain, France, Illyria, Constantinople, the same obedience which he claimed from Catholic England. "We have sent you the pallium as a gift from Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles," wrote St. Gregory to Leander, Bishop of Seville. To Vergilius, Bishop of Arles, he gave "the vicegerency of the churches belonging to the kingdom of our illustrious son Childebert, according to the *ancient custom*." To Had-

rian, Bishop of Thebes, he wrote: "By the authority of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, we cancel and annul the decrees which you have passed." To a certain monk, Athanasius, in Asia Minor, he gave leave to return to his monastery, to be reinstated in his former position, thus reversing the sentence of the Patriarch. In short, he exercised every kind of authority which appertained to an ecclesiastical ruler. He prescribed synods, received appeals, annulled decrees, deposed bishops, judged of faith, marked out dioceses; and he did it all with language which showed his assurance that all such "plenitude" would be recognized by all the persons to whom he wrote. And at this point the observation may be made, that St. Gregory the Great acted in this manner fully two centuries and a half before the discovery of what are known as the "Forged Decretals." So that *their* influence on Pontifical action was simply *nil*. Only two remarks need be made about the "Forged Decretals." The first is, that the assertion of prerogative which they contained excited no surprise in the mind of Christendom, because such prerogative had been always recognized by all Christians; the second, that the phrases which were borrowed by the clumsy forger were all borrowed from Christian writers of a previous age; showing that, though the Decretals were largely forged, the faith which they embodied was primitive.

To return to England: It would be easy to quote scores of instances in which the kings submitted all spiritual matters to the Popes; as when Edward II. wrote to a Roman Cardinal, "Jesus Christ committed the care of His Church to Blessed Peter the Apostle, and in his person to his successors the Roman Pontiffs, to be ruled by them in succession forever"; and Henry VI. wrote to the Council of Basle, "From the very cradle of the Christian religion his (the Pope's) authority has been regarded as most manifest, and the plenitude of his power revered with all possible veneration." And it would be easy to quote the language of English archbishops, rendering homage to the same acknowledged primary truth; as when St. Anselm wrote, "I will speed me to the Supreme Pastor, the Chief of all, the Angel of Great Council"; and Archbishop Winchelsey petitioned the Pontiff, "Your devoted daughter, the Church of Canterbury, asks for the pallium, taken from the body of the Blessed Peter, to be granted to its elect, who has been consecrated, in order that he may have the plenitude of his office." But we are not writing a book, only a suggestive fragment; and what has been said may suffice to indicate these two facts: (1) that the English bishops and archbishops, from the days of St. Augustine, would no more have thought of disputing the plenitude of the Pope's power than of disputing the

right of their temporal sovereign to his civil plenitude; and (2) that *no* temporal king ever said to the Pontiff, "we reject your spiritual jurisdiction"; all that the worst kings ever said was, "you are crossing the frontier-line, which divides the spiritual from the temporal jurisdiction; and *we* choose to be sole judges of that frontier-line, and not to permit you to say where it begins or ends."

IV.

To attempt to describe the religion of all England, from the days of Augustine to Henry VIII., would be superfluous after having described its obedience; for all the world knows that obedience to the Holy See means the whole Roman Catholicism of the present day. No one disputes that the two go together, always have gone together, and always must. Let us then by way of testing continuity, briefly picture the English religion of the last three centuries; not the religion of the quite modern sect, the Ritualist, but of all Anglican Protestants who preceded them. We will not exaggerate, nor indulge in sarcasm. We will only try to picture in a few words the "divine worship" of ninety-nine out of a hundred Anglicans, in their town and country churches and chapels.

An altar, always spoken of as a table; the clergy never called priests, but commonly ministers; holy communion administered only once a month; three boxes piled in front of the communion table—pulpit, reading desk, and clerk's desk—so as to obscure the very remembrance of a Christian altar; the font usually put away into some corner; the clergyman's robe carefully divested of every significance of a sacrificing, an absolving, or a dogmatic order; the church-pews always suggesting that so uninteresting a divine service required exceptional personal ease for its endurance; the sermons frequently flavored with some abuse of Catholic doctrine, and with some praise of the glorious liberties of the national Protestantism; the younger clergy always occupied with matrimonial anticipations, and the elder clergy much more domestic than even Protestant; the bishops "high and dry scholars and lordly magnates, who esteemed a palace as much as they disesteemed a curate"; and the whole religion of the whole Establishment consisting in "Dearly Beloved Brethren," read on Sundays from a hideous wooden reading desk; and supplemented by a poor essay, in which Almighty God was kindly instructed what He ought to believe in regard to the holy Protestant faith.

Continuity! But the Ritualists say, "Ah, see how we have changed all that. We have restored the Church of England to what it was in the earliest centuries; we have brought back Catholicity into Protestant churches; we have wiped out three centuries of vile Erastianism, and have re-clothed our ancient Church with

its first spirit ; we have utterly repudiated the whole work of the Reformers, and have taken back to us a good three-fourths of mediævalism ; stopping short only where obedience to the Holy See would have deprived us of our right to please ourselves. We are therefore now a true branch of the Catholic Church. We refuse to recognize any kind of Protestant dissenter, and so we prove that we possess the power of excommunication. If only the Roman Church would abandon its idea of corporate oneness, and allow that the Church of Christ may be different in different countries, we would gladly give her the right hand of fellowship, and even teach her several truths which she does not know. And it is by this spirit that we prove our continuity."

We naturally ask the Ritualists. Who gave *you* the authority to reconstruct your own national church ; to call your ancestors for three centuries Protestant heretics ; to affirm that they were all wrong in *not* saying Mass, and in not teaching several truths which you call Catholic ? You, the Ritualists, are members of the same church which, for three centuries, has taught the opposite of what you teach ; have you then received a special revelation, or has the divine authority of the *Ecclesia Docens* devolved solely upon *you* ; that you can not only teach the Roman Church, and the Eastern sects ; not only rebuke the Middle Ages and the Augustine age ; but can also teach and rebuke the whole lifetime of your own communion, put all your bishops right, and severely chide even your primates, and claim for yourselves an exclusive Catholic continuity.

For the great difficulty for the Ritualists comes in here : That, whatever authority they possess, they must derive it through their communism alone, and therefore that communism must have always possessed the illumination, the intellectual and the spiritual illumination, which the Ritualists are supposed to have derived from it. Therefore, that communism must have been always competent to determine truth, nay, *did* determine truth, unless it were apostate ; but, if it were apostate, it was no true Church, and the Ritualists have consequently no inheritance. To realize their position, imagine the (impossible) case of the Catholic Church teaching in the sixteenth century that the doctrine of transubstantiation was *de fide* ; and then teaching, in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, that a table ought to be substituted for an altar. The Catholic Church would have to abandon its continuity. Yet the Ritualists, who belong to a church which for three centuries has reviled doctrines which *they* account to be " of faith," want to claim their continuity through that church up to the Church of, say, A. D. 100 ; while affirming that the Church of A. D. 100 was even at that time so purely human, so derelict, that it had already

began to fall into grave error. How can the Church be both divine and not divine? How can a church which has fallen into doctrinal falsehoods be guaranteed against doing so again? How can the Ritualists derive a pure, untainted Catholicity through three centuries of (more or less) doctrinal apostasy; following, as these three centuries are said to have done, upon ten centuries of error in regard to the Popedom; and even these ten centuries following upon five centuries of fallibility, which resulted in perfectly immeasurable wrong teaching? The theory is the very essence of confusion. It is a very chaos of contradiction, intellectual and spiritual; as absurd in the rational order as it is impious in the divine order; besides giving the direct denial to the promise of our Lord, "the gates of hell shall never prevail against it."

V.

In so vast a subject, spreading over a period of nineteen centuries, it has been difficult to take each point in order, as might be done in, say, a hundred and twenty pages. We may now briefly summarize the whole argument, trying to put each point succinctly so as to show that continuity cannot belong to "a kingdom which is divided against itself."

The Catholic idea is that of the Kingdom of God upon earth. It is also the idea of the Christian family, of the family of the Incarnate Son of God. "Son, behold thy mother; mother, behold thy Son," being the beautiful benediction of this one family. Heresy and schism are an absolute impossibility in a family with such an origin, such a purpose. Unity is the prime idea and the necessity. This unity is in chief of three kinds: (1) of visible and conspicuous community; (2) of one and the same doctrinal belief, and (3) of one and the same obedience to authority. The visibility demands a visible head; the perfection of doctrine demands infallibility, and obedience presupposes divine rule.

The Catholic Church has always realized this ideal. No other community has ever done so. We argued, at the beginning of this short paper, that the fact of the early saints all pleading that oneness was the note and characteristic of the true Church proved also the converse, that the absence of that oneness was fatal to the Catholicity of any sect. But oneness was only possible on the condition of obedience to one and the same visible head, and therefore the Popedom was, to even the natural apprehension, an absolute necessity for the Christian Church. As a matter of fact we showed that the Popedom was always accepted as the corner-stone of Christian government, and that the Christian creed and the Christian ritual were never dissociated from that authority which gave to both the divine sanction of authenticity. Above all things

it had to be borne in mind that the Holy Mass was from the first the divine worship of all Christians throughout the world ; around the altar, the tabernacle, where was Jesus Christ, were gathered all hearts, souls and intellects of the Christian family, all other truths being seen or realized by the light which was cast upon them by the ever-abiding presence of the Son of God. Thus oneness of faith, love, obedience was realized in every Catholic Church.

We next briefly touched on three points : (1) the repudiation by the Anglican reformers, and by their formularies, of almost the whole of the distinctively Catholic creed of Christendom ; (2) the assertion by Henry VIII. before his shameless apostasy, of the divine authority and the universality of the Pope's supremacy ; and (3) the consequent absurdity of Henry VIII.'s family of Protestants affecting to have continuity from the Catholic family, save only in the use of words which have lost their sense. Queen Elizabeth's personal creation of a new church—which was only forced upon the nation by penal laws—was then shown to be as purely human as her new orders, the "succession" of such orders being ridiculed by the new clergy and repudiated by all Christendom east and west, and only fictitiously rendered valid by Acts of Parliament and by Queen Elizabeth's own assertion of her pretensions to divine power. In matter, form, intention, such conservations were invalid, the true Catholic priests, like the true Catholic laity, continuing to be in communion with the Holy See ; so that the *Ecclesia Docens* never died out in England, nor was continuity lost for a single moment. The new church of England, the present church, came into existence in the year 1662, and it is this new church which the queen is vowed to defend, which parliament now controls and over which no bishop has any power ; yet within which the bishops receive their jurisdiction from kings, queens, parliaments, prime ministers, which is therefore only a purely civil jurisdiction, and which confers no right to any exercise of spiritual power.

Our next point was to revert to the popular objection, that the "English kings had always resisted Papal pretensions" ; because this delusion is made to do duty for sound argument against the continuity of English Catholics from the early Church. It was a controversy which could not possibly be avoided, in any suggestive argument as to continuity ; and the line we took was this—and we are convinced of its historical accuracy, as Hallam, Lingard, Macaulay clearly show—that there was never any denial of Papal authority ; there was only quarrelling about the precise position of the frontier-line, which divided things spiritual from things temporal. It would have been strange indeed, if, in the long period of nineteen centuries, there had not been frequent conflicts between the two powers ; seeing that the very object of

the spiritual power, its divine mission, its reason of being, was to subject the world to divine principles of truth, to teach kings as well as peoples their whole duty, and always to protect oppressed Christians against their tyrants, of whom there were sure to be a great many in nineteen centuries. And since the very tyrants who resisted Papal counsel were forced to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See; were forced to acknowledge that the whole of Christendom had always believed in the first principle, that the Head of the Christian Church was Christ's Vicar; their resistance was only the resistance of human nature; it was not the repudiating or the questioning of the Catholic faith. Henry VIII. was the single example of a tyrant who wrote a book to convict himself of apostasy; assuring Christendom in his virtuous days that the Papal supremacy was a divine power, and, in his vicious days, transferring that power to himself. Yet Henry VIII. was only an exaggeratedly bad man, who had many predecessors in the arts of kingly cunning.

Our last point was the contrast between the religion of the Middle Ages and the religion of three centuries of Protestantism; two extremes, two adverse principles, two mortal foes, which had positively nothing in common but an historical belief in Christianity, and in the natural sentiment which is inseparable from such a fact. So that it was easy to show that continuity from Catholic truth was an impossibility for the Protestants of three centuries; and since the Ritualists derive their continuity from Protestants, and also impute falsehood to pre-Reformation teaching, their continuity, if they have any, must be of so very mixed a kind that it must have a good deal more of Protestantism than of Ritualism.

VI.

This ends our controversy. Yet we may be permitted to add a word in conclusion, on what we may call the moral aspect of the question; the common sense estimate of the whole matter; apart from wranglings about historic details, human conflicts, which really cannot affect the subject, supernaturally.

Anglicans admit that Christianity is divine, that the Catholic Church is, as it were, the "Second Incarnation"; that one Lord, one faith, one baptism, is the fact as well as the idea of that Incarnation; that therefore heresy is deadly sin, shivering the unity of Christ's Church; and schism is like the frightful revolt in a Christian family, which makes the household to be a hell on earth instead of a heaven; in short, they admit that the Church was a divine institution, designed to include all men in all ages,

whatever their natural varieties in point of character, or their secular or temporal history or tradition.

Here they stop. Directly they come to apply these abstract ideas it is seen that they find them practically unworkable. The Church, they say, is a teaching power, not subject to corruption, yet somehow it is always tumbling into deadly error; it is the Rock against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, yet somehow they have prevailed against it for sixteen centuries; it is necessarily, as it were, essentially, immutable, being a divine not a human institution, yet, strange to say, it is one thing at one time, and another thing at another time, and even many different things at the same time; possibly almost perfect in the primitive times, but then corrupt at its very roots for many centuries; and only to be found in these latter days in its perfect integrity in the little sect of the Ritualists within the Church of England.

Realizing the "baseless fabric" of such a Church, the Ritualists try to believe that their continuity is derived from the fountain head of the earliest times; utterly heedless of the fact that continuity through non-continuousness is both naturally and supernaturally an impossibility. That which has come to an end, as did primitive infallibility (according to the wide theory of the Ritualists) cannot be renewed by its inherent power. The inherent power is gone, and gone forever. Henceforth fallibility becomes the sole pledge of divine doctrines for all Christians in all ages to the end of the world. Thus fallibility is the continuity of infallibility; an assertion as absurd as that infallibility can become fallible, or that the fallible can re-invest itself with infallibility. If the Church ever *was* divine, it *is* divine. If the Church was ever able to say, "This is true, that is false," then, just as it said so in the days of Pelagius¹ so does it say infallibly in this century, "this is true, that is false;" nor is there any continuity of Christianity without obedience. Disobedience is most certainly a continuity; it is the continuity of Adam's sin—and of Pelagius's; but to say that it is the continuity of Christianity is to fly in the face of common sense, natural morality. What must be called the moral aspect of continuity is as easy to be judged of in Christianity as in any inheritance which is grounded on natural law; and the continuity of the Ritualists is exactly the same as the continuity of disowned and, disinherited, wayward sons. When the Ritualist says to the Catholic Church, "you are wrong; *we* alone are heirs of the

¹ Pelagius, by the way, was a British heretic; and after he was excommunicated by the Holy See, he wrote to the Pope, "I desire to be corrected by you, who hold both Peter's faith and See; but if this my confession is approved by the judgment of your apostleship, then whosoever endeavors to cast blots on me will prove himself either ignorant, or malicious, or not a Catholic."

pure faith of the primitive church; *our* infallibility extends to the supreme judgment of our own church, of all the Middle Ages, and, of course, specially and radically, of the Holy See; and *we* in the plenitude of our apostolic wisdom, pronounce ourselves to be continuous—not from *you*, not from the Middle Ages, not from the faith of the canonized saints of a dozen centuries, but from that infallibility which died out before Augustine, to be renewed only by Dr. Pusey and Dr. Littledale, and a few other chosen spirits of modern Anglicanism”; we cannot help asking to be excused from grave argument, for it is difficult to be grave about such trifling. Continuity of disobedience from obedience; of personal, individual infallibility from the infallibility of the undivided Catholic Church; of the spiritual headship of Queen Victoria, of her parliaments and privy councils, from that of the Supreme Pontificate of St. Peter; of a parliamentary form of divine service from the Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass; of two sacraments from Seven Sacraments; of a married clergy from an unmarried priesthood; of no confession from habitual confession; of no religious orders from many religious orders; of a hundred different opinions, views, interpretations, from one and the same faith in all ages, in all countries, and under every test of secular or heretical opposition; of the Thirty-nine Articles from General Councils; of the “Canterbury” of to-day from the Canterbury of St. Anselm or of St. Thomas; of the modern Westminster Abbey from the abbey of the Confessor; or of the comfortable, domestic closes of the cathedrals from the monasticism and the celibacy of Catholic rule; of one incessant roar of doctrinal strife and newspaper theologies from the “still, small voice” of the Holy Spirit of God, directing all intellects to know and believe the same truths, while leaving them free to question everything that was not “of faith”; of—but we may sum it all up in one word, the continuity of the human from the divine! Common sense is the only “theologian” that is wanted. Not until chaos can be continuity of the divine order, or exact contraries the continuity of identities, can the Church of England establish her claim to Catholic unity with the One, Holy, Undivided CHURCH OF CHRIST.

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

COMPOSTELLA AND THE SHRINE OF ST. JAMES.

A YACHT bound on a delightful summer cruise, and bearing a party bent on mingled pleasure and instruction, has only, on leaving New York, to steer her course to the east along the 41st parallel of latitude to reach Oporto or the mouth of the Minho. This beautiful river separates Portugal from the Spanish province of Galicia, "the Bay Country," *el país de las Rias*. The seafarer, continuing to sail northward along these enchanting shores, will find such a succession of magnificent estuaries, broad, deep, and penetrating far into the land, as is to be met with nowhere else in the Old World. The deep bays which indent the south and western coasts of Ireland can alone compare with the glorious *rias* of Vigo, Pontevedra and Arosa. Twice a year the iron-clad fleets of Great Britain select the broad bosom of the last-named estuary for their evolutions.

The soil and climate of this favored land would make the traveller from Asia fancy himself back again on the fairest shores of Palestine and Syria. And, in good sooth, the intelligent and enterprising Phœnicians, from the earliest historic ages, were not slow in finding out this early home of the Gael, and in establishing—from *Gades*, the modern Cadiz, and *Hispalis*, the Seville of our day, to Cape Finisterre—profitable marts for the exchange of the rich stuffs, the beautiful pottery, and other products of Phœnician industry.

Up the calm, sunny waters of that superb Bay of Arosa, the largest and northernmost of the Galician estuaries, a Phœnician trading-vessel was sailing about the year of Our Lord 43. It threaded its way securely among the many lovely islands which gem the upper portion of the bay, until it entered the deep stream of the Ulla, and cast anchor before the Roman town or municipium of Iria Flavia. On this vessel were Theodore and Athanasius, two of the devoted disciples of the Apostle James the Elder, and his fellow-laborers in Spain before the latter's journey to Jerusalem during the great famine of the years 40 and 41 (A. D.). James, like the other Apostles dispersed over the surface of the Roman empire, had hastened to Jerusalem to bring the alms of the Spanish Christians to their famine-stricken brethren of Palestine.¹

The persecuting rage of the Pharisees and Sadducees was roused to increased violence by the presence in Jerusalem of the Apostles

¹ See Acts of the Apostles xi., 28, 29, 30; xii., 1 and following.

and their disciples. St. James must have distinguished himself above his brethren by his characteristic zeal and outspokenness ; for he drew on himself the chief hatred of the Sanhedrim and the animadversion of King Herod. Now about that time, " Herod the king stretched forth his hands to afflict some of the Church. And he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword. And, seeing that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to take up Peter also. Now it was in the days of the Azymes. And when he had apprehended him, he cast him into prison, . . . intending after the Pasch to bring him forth to the people."¹

So James, who, with Peter and John, had been privileged to witness the Transfiguration of Our Lord on Mount Thabor, and was chosen to be with Him during the terrible agony of His soul in the Garden of Olives, was the first of the apostolic company to shed his blood in Jerusalem. He drank the cup of Christ's passion during the Eastertide and in the holy city. Peter was selected as a still more pleasing victim for the sacrifice, to be offered to the popular fury ere the paschal solemnities were ended. But Peter's appointed work was not yet accomplished ; and God's angel saved him from Herod and the Jews.

The faithful companions of the martyred James obtained possession of his body, bore it in all haste and secrecy to the nearest seaport, Joppa, where they happily found a Phœnician merchantman bound for the southwestern coast of Spain. On this they embarked with their treasure, trusting to Providence for a safe issue to their voyage.

A numerous band of the disciples of the Apostle-martyr soon joined Athanasius and Theodore. Their names, to the number of thirteen, are mentioned by the early Spanish annalists, and by Bolandus and Henschius in the "*Acta Sanctorum*."² These zealous and faithful fellow-workers had not been idle among the Gael while James and his two companions were performing the errand of charity and zeal which ended so tragically in Jerusalem. And now that the Apostle of Spain had been brought back in death to rest forever in the field of his labors, far away from the shore of his native sea of Galilee, there were fervent Christians to meet him at Iria Flavia. One of them, a Gallo-Roman lady, named Lupa, helped the disciples in their need, and had the body of her beloved master conveyed with all due secrecy into the interior of the country, in an ox-cart, such as farmers used. This was to baffle the jealous vigilance of the hostile Jews and Pagans.

Arrived at a property of her own, she surrendered to Athanasius and Theodore the marble sarcophagus prepared beforehand for

¹ *Ibidem* xii., 1-4.

² *Acta Sanctorum*, Februarius, tom. i., p. 6.

her own burial, as was then the custom. Her family vault was on the face of a hillock amid a grove of larch and oak. There they set about erecting over the tomb-vaulted chamber, one of the *Memorie*, or memorial chapels, so often mentioned by the Christian writers of the early ages of the Church.

This hillock, and the farm of which it was a part, have borne ever since the name of Libredon, most probably from their being the free gift (*Liberum donum*) of the proprietress, Lupa, to the Apostle, her father in Christ. The hillock itself was only the spur of a neighboring mountain, known popularly as Monte Burgo.

This sacred *Memoria* on the hillside, containing the body of St. James the Elder, is the centre around which has grown up the glorious city of St. James (Santiago), with its great cathedral and the magnificent monastic edifices and hospitals for pilgrims, which were the wonder of Christendom ever since the end of the ninth century. Mountain, hillside, and the neighboring slopes and valleys, all form the site on which piety and history have bestowed the appellation of Compostella (*Campus Stellæ*), "the field of the star." How aptly this name was given we shall presently see.

In course of time the two inseparable companions in life and death of St. James, Athanasius and Theodore, closed their career, and were buried by the side of their venerated master. Long before this, however, and as soon as the memorial chapel had been completed, the majority of the thirteen disciples, leaving a few behind them to minister to the spiritual wants of the Galician Christians, set out for Rome, obtained episcopal consecration at the hands of St. Peter, and then returned to Spain to continue the work of their apostleship.

The history of the Church, in this part of the Iberian Peninsula, is surrounded with no little obscurity during the remainder of the first century and down to the era of Constantine the Great. This same obscurity hangs over the fate of the memorial chapel at Libredon. It is easily accounted for.

The persecution which, under successive emperors from Nero down, raged in Rome and throughout Italy against the Christian name, was, generally speaking, far more relentless in the Provinces of the Roman empire than in the neighborhood of the Capital. The annals and traditions of almost every city of Italy attest the foundation of each principal see, either by some disciple of the Apostles, or, by a follower of these immediate disciples. Thus, Ravenna which, in the first and second centuries, was the great imperial shipyard and military storehouse of the vast Roman fleets, was evangelized by St. Apollinaris, ordained bishop by St. Peter, and appointed to the work of the apostolate in Ravenna. Apollinaris shed his blood in defence of the flock he had gathered to Christ;

so did more than one of his successors. So was it with Milan, in the north of Italy, and with Naples in the south. Nor did it fare otherwise with the churches of Asia, Africa, and Greece. St. James the Younger was stoned to death in Jerusalem, and his successors in that see, for centuries, only looked forward to a bloody death as to the natural inheritance left by their predecessors. We all know, in Asia Minor what befel St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist; and St. Ignatius, and St. Irenæus. It was the same heroic tale of suffering told in every part of the empire. That the persecution should have been less fierce along the Ulla and the Minho might be accounted for by the remoteness of this land of the Gael, and by the peaceful habits of a pastoral people, sheltered by their forests and mountains. We know how plentifully the blood of Christians flowed in the south and east of Spain, as well as in the north, in Seville, in Valencia, in Barcelona, and in Saragossa.

However, long before the Roman emperors had ceased to wage war on the unresisting followers of Christ, or the proconsuls and magistrates in the provinces had ceased to hunt them down or proscribe them, the barbarian invasions began to shake, wave upon wave in quick succession, the mighty fabric of the Roman power. The barbarians, at first, were no less ferocious enemies of Christianity, no less unsparing destroyers of such Christian edifices as dared to appear above ground, than the pagans of Rome and Greece, of Africa and Asia. The fertile regions of southern Gaul fell an easy prey to the invading hordes, who soon poured across the Pyrenees.

Between the unrelenting persecutions of their Roman masters and the destructive ferocity of the first barbarian invaders, the Christians of Spain knew no rest from evil. The Suevi, who possessed themselves of Galicia, were, if anything, more cruel and oppressive than either Goth or Vandal. The Christian societies on either shore of the Bay of Arosa, or along the course of the Ulla and the neighboring streams, were either exterminated or reduced to slavery, or driven to the hospitable fastnesses of the Asturian mountains. Thus fared it with generation after generation of the much tried Christians of Galicia. All local traditions were lost among the scattered and suffering remnants of the Gallo-Roman population evangelized by Saints Athanasius and Theodore.

Iria Flavia was ruined. The forest protected from observation the lowly memorial chapel with its treasures. To be sure, the tradition continued throughout Spain that her apostle had been buried in Galicia. But in Galicia itself the accumulated misfortunes of so many ages had blotted out from the memory of men all knowledge of the precise spot which contained his relics. The Suevi,

who kept their grip on the fair and fertile lands of Galicia, were Arians, like the Visigoths who held sway throughout the rest of Spain down to the Moorish invasion. So that everything among the Christian Celts of northwestern Spain, during these troublous centuries, tended but little toward reviving the memories of the hallowed dead.

When the Mohammedans, in the eighth century, possessed themselves of the fairest provinces of Spain, the men who fought for faith and country found a safe asylum, an impregnable stronghold in the Asturias. The Galicians, then forming in language and blood one great community with the Portuguese, opposed a mighty barrier to the progress of the infidels.

Meanwhile a town of some four or five hundred souls had arisen near the hill which held the *Memoria* of St. James and his two disciples. This town bore the name of San Fins¹ de Lovio, and the forest-covered hill that had so long kept the secret of its buried treasure was known as Monte Burgo de Libredon. Their population formed a part of the diocese of Iria Flavia; for that Roman Municipium, like the Imperial City of Braga beyond the Minho, remained amid its ruin and decay an episcopal see.

The tide of warfare between the Mohammedan invaders and the Christian princes was then (about 813) rolling, back and forth unceasingly, its fierce waves from the foothills of the Asturias to Cadiz and Valencia. From Cordova, the capital of the Moslem power in the peninsula, the conquering infidels seemed to be strengthening their hold on the country, if not extending their possessions. It was the first stage of that sublime struggle of seven hundred years by a Christian people against their irreconcilable foes, of which history affords no parallel save in Catholic Ireland's battle of centuries against British Protestantism.

The period from 770 to 820 was, according to the rich and beautiful literature describing the last heroic enterprises of Charlemagne and his barons, the time when the emperor crossed the Pyrenees at their head to drive back the Moslems to Africa, and to free from their yoke the tomb of the Apostle, St. James. Certain it is, that the current traditions, dating from the beginning of the ninth century, and embodied in the romantic recitals of the age, tell us how the emperor, at Aix-la-Chapelle, was warned in a vision of the dangers which threatened the extinction of Christianity in Spain, and was clearly shown the road which was to lead him and his soldiers to Iria Flavia, and the then undiscovered shrine which held the remains of St. James and his two disciples. All this is stated at length in the writings of Padre Fita and other Spanish

¹ Written also "Finns." The early local annalists call it also "St. Felix."

archæologists, who have, in our day, thrown such light around Compostella and its hallowed memories.

Without pronouncing any judgment on the historical value of these legends, certain it is, that in the year 813, according to Archdeacon Zepedano's sober and conscientious history,¹ it pleased Our Lord to comfort and strengthen the Christian hosts who were battling for the faith in Spain, by revealing to them miraculously the burial-place of His beloved companion, apostle, and martyr.

There exists abundant documentary evidence dating from the ninth century and the ages immediately following, which go to attest all the facts connected with the revelation or re-discovery of the Apostle's tomb and the authenticity of his remains.

It happened during the pontificate of St. Leo III. (795-816) and the reign of Alfonso II., surnamed the Chaste, who was king of the Asturias and Leon from 793 to 842. There is a letter of the holy Pope to the bishops of Spain congratulating them on the re-discovery of the body of St. James, acknowledging its authenticity, reciting the facts of the Apostle's labor in the peninsula, his martyrdom in Jerusalem, the translation of his remains to Iria Flavia and their burial not far from that sea-port. It is the same ground covered by the bull of the Thirteenth Leo, *Deus Omnipotens*, issued on November the 1st, 1884, after two of the most thorough, judicial, and scientific investigations ever instituted.

The most ancient narrative of the discovery of the Memorial Chapel is given in a ninth century manual of a noble Brotherhood, known as the Caballeros Cambeadores of Santiago, who were, immediately after the finding of the tomb and the identification of the remains, founded in Compostella by Alfonso-the-Chaste to watch over the basilica he was rearing above the tomb. Their duties also comprised the guidance and protection of pilgrims, procuring them hospitality, changing gratuitously the money brought with them from abroad into the local Galician currency. This kind office secured foreign pilgrims from the impositions practised even in the ninth century by the money-changers, who were for the most part Jews. It also gave rise to the name popularly given to this Brotherhood—the Cambeadores. By the royal decree instituting this Protective Society of knights none were admitted to membership but the sons of the highest nobility. We see here the origin of the Knights of Santiago or St. James of Compostella and the other orders of chivalry founded to protect pilgrims on their way to and from the shrine of the Apostle.

But let us see how St. Finns de Libredon came to be called Compostella, and how the Memorial Chapel and its treasure were

¹ *Historia de la Basilica Compostellana*, p. 12.

found anew. We translate from the Manual of the Cambeadores, written in the ancient local or Galician dialect :

"This book," it says, "relates the origin of the Cambeadores of the Church of St. James (*Santiago*), and how the body of St. James in its full integrity was revealed.

"It had remained hidden away in a marble sarcophagus in an underground cave formed of two stone vaults. This cave was in the middle space of Monte Burgo of Libredon, and at the foot of the village of St. Finns de Solobio, in the canton of Bonaval. In the place was also another village called Caminho¹ from the name of the road leading directly to the Church of the Apostle.

"St. Finns then counted some 400 inhabitants. Below it was a lofty spur or hillock covered with a forest growth of larches and great gnarled oaks. In the midst of this wooded steep people began to see bright lights accompanied with harmonious voices. Stars also appeared. There was one oak tree towering above the others, and over it would shine forth a star-like body surpassing the other lights in splendor.

"Thereupon San Payo, a hermit who was wont to celebrate Mass for the inhabitants of St. Finns informed Theodomir, Bishop of Iria Flavia, of these manifestations. The bishop forthwith set out with his priests and attendants, arriving at Solobio on the 24th day of July. Taking up his abode with his suite in a castle belonging to one of his relatives, a gentleman by name Espanya, he watched the phenomena from his lofty position. In the middle of the night appeared the lights with the star-like bodies—among these the bright star above the giant oak.

"The next morning the holy bishop sang Mass in Solobio, and then went to where this great oak tree stood. They cleared away the forest growth until they came to the holy cave. On entering it they saw that it had been skilfully constructed with its double arched vault. There was a small altar, and beneath it a sarcophagus covered with a slab. Two other sarcophagi stood one on each side of the altar, but lower than the central tomb.

"They (the bishop and his people) began a solemn supplication, the entire population fasting. Then, as if by inspiration, they opened the middle sarcophagus and saw that they had found the body of the holy apostle. For the head was detached from the trunk and he held a pilgrim's staff wrapped in a lettered scroll, which said : ' Here lieth James the son of Zebedee and of Salome, the brother of John—who was put to death by Herod in Jerusalem and came by sea with his two disciples as far as Iria Flavia in Galicia, and was thence borne hither in an ox cart belonging to Lupa, the owner of this field. Further they did not wish to go.'

¹ The original text is in the old Gallego or Galician dialect common to Galicia and Portugal, which formed one political province down to the twelfth century.

“ ‘Cecilius, disciple of the apostle, together with the other disciples, erected this.’ ”¹

Fortunately there exist in more than one martyrology in use before the ninth century the most explicit attestations of the prevailing belief that the Apostle St. James had preached the Gospel in Spain, and that, after his martyrdom in Jerusalem, his body had been carried to this field of his labors and buried there. Then, it has ever been the constant tradition in Galicia, that the episcopal see of Iria Flavia was founded by the Apostle.

Bishop Theodomir lost no time in informing his sovereign, Alfonso II., of the discovery of the Memorial Chapel at Libredon, and of the preternatural phenomena which had led to it. Meanwhile the population far and near, moved by the discovery and by the miracles performed in the cave on the hillside, were pouring into St. Finns.

On this steep hillside, above the memorial chapel and the triple tomb, soon arose a basilica, with a group of monastic institutions belonging to the Order of St. Benedict, the zealous monks ministering to the spiritual needs of the ever-increasing multitude of pilgrims. The mountain of Libredon, with the forest-clad spurs and hillocks around, and the valley beneath, were from that year of 813 called Compostella in the Galician tongue (*Campus Stellæ*, the field of the star). On this favored site soon grew rapidly the historic Santiago, the city of St. James.

Alfonso II. hastened with the foremost amongst his clergy and nobles to come to Libredon, and with them bore solemn witness to the facts authenticated by Bishop Theodomir, the saintly hermit of Payo, and the populations of Solobio and Caminho.

The abrupt hillside was a most unfavorable site for the erection of a large church edifice. But the sturdy and intelligent builders of the ninth and succeeding centuries were accustomed to overcome difficulties which would appal our modern architects. They cut down the steep slope so as to construct, on a level with the top of the arched memorial chapel, a vast platform on which were laid the foundations of the contemplated basilica, bearing the name of San Salvador, in honor of the Saviour for whom St. James had shed his blood. In the church thus built the high altar was placed directly over that in the crypt or cave beneath, where reposed the body of the apostle with his two faithful companions. The entire building, as well as that of the adjoining Benedictine Monastery, was planned and constructed with an eye to solidity and security. The pagan Norsemen were scouring the northern and southern seas and making ruthless war on every religious edifice. The terrible Mos-

¹ *Historia y Descripción Arqueológica de la Basilica Compostelana*, por el Doctor D. Jose Zepedano, Lugo, 1870.

lem hordes were carrying desolation into every part of Spain left exposed to their incursions. Alfonso-the-Chaste wisely determined to secure, in so far as he could, the newly discovered tomb and its priceless treasures against the sudden attacks of all enemies of the Christian name. Thus the Basilica of the Saviour with the adjoining edifices, resembled more a fortress than a peaceful house of prayer. Things remained in this state for upwards of seventy years. Alphonso II. had endeavored to provide generously for the support of the clergy, both regular and secular, by granting them (or rather St. James himself) the ownership in fee simple of the land for a circuit of three miles, together with taxes and revenue derived from other places.¹ Then it was that Pope Leo III. to whom King Alfonso made known all that had just happened in the Field of the Star, wrote his letter of congratulation.²

Under Alfonso III., in July, 896, a new and more spacious edifice was begun. This was consecrated in May, 899, in presence of the royal family, seventeen bishops, and a vast concourse of all classes. In 977 this edifice was destroyed by the celebrated Almanzor, the Vizier of Hiquem or Hixem II., Caliph of Cordova. Almanzor thought, in his fanatical hatred of Christianity, that by destroying the Shrine of Compostella he should deal a mortal blow to Christianity in Spain, yet he did not, nevertheless, succeed in violating the tomb of the Apostle. This could only be reached through an opening in the floor of the upper church. When the ruthless conqueror penetrated to the crypt, he found, seated before the shrine, a man,—a monk some say,—of venerable and majestic aspect, who reproached Almanzor with all the blood he had shed, and the sacrileges he had committed, and told him that the justice of God would strike him down before he could return to Cordova.

Almanzor had already despoiled the basilica of its treasures. The bells he had taken down from the towers and sent on before him, with the beautiful doors of the temple, to Cordova, borne on the shoulders of the captive citizens of Compostella. After having levelled to the ground as much as time would permit him of the upper church, and burned the monastery and city, Almanzor set forth on other expeditions. Victory followed his standards everywhere till he came to Medina-Celi. There a fearful pestilence resembling Asiatic cholera fell suddenly on his army, and threatened its utter extermination. Almanzor himself was seized by the

¹ See the Royal Diploma, in Don José Zepedano's *History*, pp. 34 and 35.

² This letter, Don Zepedano assures us (p. 14), has been verified by Mgr. Giovanni Grimaldi, Prefect of the Vatican Archives. It is, moreover, quoted at length in the great manuscript work, *The Book of Calistus II.* (1119-1124), preserved in the treasury of Compostella, and which Cardinal Paya was thinking of publishing while the writer was in Galicia (1882-83).

avenging plague, and died amid the most excruciating tortures, declaring to his attendants that, "in all his vast army there was not one man so much to be pitied as their chief."

Meanwhile the spoils of Compostella, with the cathedral doors and bells, were received in triumph in Cordova. The doors adorned the entrance to the great mosque, and the bells, plated with gold and silver, were hung up and used as lamps in the mosque itself. There King St. Ferdinand found them, when, on June 30, 1235, he entered Cordova as conqueror. He compelled the ministers and guardians of the mosque to carry the bells back to Compostella on their own shoulders. It was a just application of the *lex talionis*.¹

But the stout-hearted Galicians were not prevented by the ruin wrought by Almanzor from repairing, without a day's delay, the ruin he had caused in Santiago. King Bermudo II. made it his especial care to rebuild and enlarge the basilica and to fortify it against sudden attacks. It was then reconsecrated,—a far more beautiful edifice than before.

In the eleventh century the Northmen invaded Galicia a second time; and the Bishop, Don Cresconio, who had performed a heroic part in repelling the invaders, not only fortified the junction of the Rio de Padron with the Sar, but surrounded Compostella with high and strong walls, and erected on the west front of the cathedral two great towers which were deemed impregnable.

With the conversion of the Northmen to Christianity and the repression in Spain of the Mohammedan pride and power, the long-felt need of a more spacious church edifice gave rise to the great Cathedral of St. James, as it now stands with its successive modifications. We say "great" in a qualified sense. It was, on account of the declivity on which the primitive memorial chapel had been erected, found extremely difficult to rear a structure rivalling in length and breadth the great thirteenth century cathedrals of Burgos, Toledo, or even Leon. But the aim of the builders was to afford accommodation, on the great jubilee festivals, to the enormous crowds of pilgrims who flocked to the Shrine. Men came from every country in Christendom to the Shrine of St. James, drawn by the wish of reviving within their own souls the dried up or slowly flowing springs of Christian piety, or of atoning for heinous public sins by generous and heroic public penance, or, again, by the hope of obtaining near the tomb of the Apostle relief from some grievous and inveterate infirmity. They came thither to pray, to weep for their sins, not to

¹ Such is the account given of Almanzor's last expedition and death by Señor Don Joaquin Guichot, the historian of Seville.

witness the splendors of public worship. These they could behold at home, without risking long journeys over sea and land.

What the Bishop—Diego Pelaez I.—and his successors sought and obtained in enlarging as far as they could the existing basilica, was to erect as many confessionals as possible in the lengthened aisles and multiplied chapels of the new twelfth century cathedral. The Shrine of the Apostle was, in the design of the Redeemer of souls, an abundant and overflowing fountain of life within His Temple; it behooved the chief pastors there to have the cleansing and life-giving waters placed everywhere within the sacred precincts within reach of the thirsty and fainting multitudes. This design was admirably carried out by the men who began the reconstruction and enlargement of the Basilica on July 11th, 1078.

Guide books and superficial writers on Spanish subjects and localities tell their readers that the names of the architects and artists who superintended this restoration, and left such remarkable works behind them, are utterly forgotten. Well, it so happens that Aymeric, the Secretary of Calixtus II., who visited Compostella with this Pope about 1110 (and while the latter was only Archbishop of Vienne), assures us that this restoration was begun in 1078, under the direction of "Master Bernardo, a wonderful old man" (*senex mirabilis magister*), and of Master Roberto. What wonders these two distinguished architects achieved inside and outside the cathedral we are faithfully told in the "Book of Callistus II." At the time, however, when Aymeric and his master visited Compostella, not only was the cathedral unfinished, but, in 1117, the interior was utterly ruined by fire.

This was caused by the Spaniards themselves, unhappily. Dona Urraca, daughter of Alfonso VI. of Leon, had married the Count of Burgundy, brother of the Archbishop of Vienne, soon to be Pope Calixtus II. Her husband died before Alfonso VI., leaving after him an infant son, so famous afterward as Alfonso VII., El Emperador. Dona Urraca next married Alfonso I., King of Aragon, who, refusing to acknowledge the Salic Law prevailing in the Kingdom of Leon, upheld his wife's rights to the crown as against those of her infant son. An Aragonese army invaded Galicia, ravaging and destroying with barbaric ferocity. They possessed themselves of Compostella; and it was while they were contending there for the mastery that the cathedral was burned.

The Archbishop of Vienne, with his secretary, Aymeric, hastened to Galicia, to defend the rights of his nephew, the infant Alfonso VII. In Compostella he was charmed with the magnificent piety of citizens and pilgrims. His book, begun and almost finished near the Shrine of the Apostle, was completed and further added to in Rome, while he occupied the papal throne. It is one of the wonders of mediæval literature.

The Mohammedans were not slow in profiting by these feuds between the Christian princes. All through the twelfth century, as before, the most determined efforts were made by the former to regain the provinces from which they had been driven. The youth, the boyhood almost, of Alfonso VII. was spent in arms, who thereby prepared himself for the great successes which won him the title of El Emperador. Meanwhile the resources of his kingdom were taxed to the utmost to maintain a strife seemingly endless. Things came to such a pass that the Archbishop and Chapter of Compostella were forced not only to surrender the funds collected for rebuilding the cathedral, but to give up for a time their own revenues.

According to Don Zepedano, when Ferdinand II. came in pilgrimage to Compostella in 1168, the Church of the Apostle was in a pitiful condition. The ruin caused by the fire of 1117 had only been very partially repaired. The interior of the edifice was filled with scaffolding, while the impoverished clergy had no funds to continue the work, and the western nave with its aisles were scarcely begun. The king had brought with him the most skilled architect he could find, the "Master Matthew," now so well known throughout the English-speaking world. To this energetic worker the king entrusted the completion of the cathedral, providing him with ample means for the undertaking.

Master Matthew inspired his workmen with his own spirit, and in 1188, on the 1st of April, the edifice was completed, and the glorious triple arch of the western portico was thrown open to the public. It is still known by the name of *La Gloria*. It is so called from the colossal figure of Christ, enthroned in glory, in the tympanum of the central door. A modern Spanish writer, Villamil, does not exaggerate the merit of this grand work of Christian art, when he says that this portico, considered as a monumental piece of iconography, may well be esteemed as the most excellent in existence.

It is an epic in stone. In the tympanum of the central door Christ is seated on His throne and in the act of judging the living and the dead. With Him are the apostles as His assessors. The Judge displays the wounds in His hands, feet, and side. Angels on each side bear the instruments of His passion. Above the throne in the semi-circular vaulted space are seated the twenty-four elders described by St. John in the Apocalypse, all seated and half of them bearing harps, while the other half bear cups full of perfumes—the prayers of all God's saints. Two semi-circular and concentric lines of smaller figures above the thrones of the apostles and evangelists represent the multitudes of the blessed; some of them are already crowned, while others receive crowns from the

ministering angels, and others again hold books and scrolls to which they point with the finger. These are the teachers and guides of the generations among whom they live.

So much, in brief, for the tympanum and vaulting of the central door. That to your left, or the northern door with its wealth of sculpture, represents paradise. There is a world of vegetation, typical of the garden of everlasting delights, amid whose shady depths one beholds two concentric ranks of figures bearing palm branches. The corresponding space above the southern door—to your right—are the multitudes of the damned. Here the scenes of the resurrection, of the separation of the just from the wicked, and of the effects of the final doom, are graphically pictured, or rather suggested in a few masterly and eloquent touches. The whole space, above and below, is alive with the episodes of this tremendous drama.

But the last judgment, the glory of the heavenly Jerusalem and the misery of the eternally lost, are not the sole themes which the mediæval poet-artist has here treated. The life of Christ on earth and the destinies of His Church, as well as the struggles of every individual soul among His followers, are either most beautifully and clearly delineated in the lower portions of this sublime composition, or so admirably symbolized as to be intelligible to the minds of the worshipping multitudes. The exquisite grouped columns which support the central tympanum, or from which spring the arches and vaulting, are together with their pedestals and capitals, all one living mass of historical sculpture. The architects and artists who reared the church of St. James in Compostella, like those who contemporaneously labored to make of the cathedral of St Mark in Venice, "the Book of the Lamb written within and without," were inspired and directed by the same living faith. Amid the "Field of the Star" as on the blue waters of the Lagunes, around the shrine of the great son of Zebedee and Salomé as around the tomb of the second evangelist, Catholic art, like some workman sent down from the heavenly Jerusalem, created immortal masterpieces, embodying in stone which breathes and lives and speaks, the story of Christ's infinite love and the terrors of His justice.

The onyx pillar which faces you in the group supporting the tympanum of the middle porch, is covered with sculptures representing the double genealogy of Christ, His human ancestry according to Mary, His mother, and His eternal birth as the One Son of the One Living God. Look up to where the Father holds on His knees and presents to the adoring love of men and angels His Son made man and crucified for our redemption, while the Holy Spirit, as the dove, proceeds from both, and with outstretched wings prepares to descend and transform this lower world.

Then let your eyes rest on the capital of that pillar-group, and admire how *Maestro Mateo* could make the rough, dull, cold stone tell the story of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, whither the Holy Spirit had borne Him after His baptism. It was to teach every one of us, every human being who professes to follow Christ, how to open his own soul to that same Holy Spirit, and with His help to overcome this lower world. Nay, look down at the pedestal of the column, and see that human figure prostrate beneath the superincumbent mass and strangling these monstrous animals, which figure forth the worldly spirits of pride and sensuality.

The salient columns at the angles of each sustaining group are covered with a spiral growth of vegetation, like the mighty trees in a tropical forest, and among their leafage you see figures of men and animals pursuing each other—the lively image of man's perpetual battle with the animal instincts of his earthly nature.

In this unavoidable strife, the disciple of Christ has only to lift his eyes to the Model, Master, and Judge above him, and to open his heart to the ever ready grace of the Holy Ghost. The *Sursum Corda* which echoes from this grand page of sculpture, is, to him who has an eye to read, an intelligence to understand, and a heart to nobly dare, as thrilling as the divinest chant of preface that ever pealed through the aisles of the cathedral within.

I shall merely add that in the northern door you have the prophets who announced the coming of Christ, and in the southern porch the Apostles who were His companions, the founders of His Church, and the fathers of the modern civilized world.¹

Shall we, citizens of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and other great cities of the union, never have casts of this great work of *Maestro Mateo*? I ask the question now, as we are preparing to celebrate the centenary of Columbus, and to recall some at least of the glories of the great country which sent Columbus to discover the western world.

The western front as left by the architect in 1188, although embellished by works of such transcendent excellence, in no wise resembled the west front of Rheims or Amiens, of Notre Dame de Paris, of Bourges or of Chartres. The structure as beheld from the adjoining square, with its double sweep of lofty ballustrated steps, around what seemed a central door leading to the crypt, had as much the appearance of a fortified castle, as of a church edifice. The majestic front itself with its towers, although made a thing of beauty and a joy forever by *Maestro Mateo*, was evidently

¹ In 1866 Signor Buiciciani was commissioned by the Directors of the Kensington Museum to obtain an exact cast in plaster of the portico *La Gloria*. It would be a patriotic act in our great municipalities in the United States to get casts of the same for the instruction of our architects.

constructed so as to resist some sudden attack from the Moslem. And the mighty hosts which the Moorish emperors led into Spain at that same period, fully justified the design of the architect.

But, let us enter the portal of *La Gloria* as it was thrown open to the public on the day of the restored temple's consecration, April 1, 1188. The architect, who, like his brother-artists of the Middle Ages, labored chiefly for the glory of religion, has left inside the portal itself a kneeling statue, a life-like image of himself. The face is turned toward the high altar, and the tomb of St. James, which lies in the crypt immediately beneath the altar. With his right hand he strikes his breast, and in his left is a scroll with the simple words *Matthæus Architectus*.

Thus was fulfilled the wish of Pope Calixtus II. The temple which he had seen thronged to overflowing with the pilgrims who flocked to Compostella from every land in Christendom, had arisen from its ruins enlarged, beautified, a joy and a wonder to Spaniard and foreigner alike.

The innumerable hordes which crossed the Straits of Gibraltar in 1189 to 1195 under the command of the Moorish Caliph Al-Manssour, never invaded Galicia. Not till 1589, when the English fleet under Drake, after the destruction of the Armada, appeared on the coast of Northern Spain, was the shrine of St. James threatened with desecration or destruction. The English under Essex had filled Cadiz and the neighboring seaboard with dismay and horror, sacking, destroying, desecrating all that was holy. No Mohammedans could have surpassed these hordes in their work of devastation.

There was universal alarm in Compostella, Galicia, and the Asturias when Drake appeared off Corunna. The then Archbishop of Santiago, Don Juan de San Clemente at once sent away into the interior the precious relics contained in his cathedral, as well as such of the gold and silver ornaments as would tempt the cupidity of the invaders. The pious prelate took on himself alone, with the aid perhaps of some one of his clergy, whom he could trust as himself, to place the bodies of St. James and his two disciples where Drake and his men could not find them or would not seek for them. The archbishop performed his task by night and in the profoundest secrecy. The prevailing terror urged him to use all haste. Then it was that the report went abroad in Compostella and spread throughout Spain, that the archbishop and his attendants, when they approached the tomb of the Apostle, were driven back by a fierce light which radiated from the shrine. At any rate he was reported to have said to those who questioned him on the night's proceedings "that the great Apostle would know how to protect his shrine from the sacrilegious hands of his enemies."

As the days passed and no English made their appearance, the archbishop summoned the most skilled masons he could find, obliterated the entrance to the tomb from the upper Basilica, after having walled up every avenue of approach to it in the crypt itself. The real secret of what the prelate had done amid the terror and haste of his midnight work in the shrine, died with him. Both clergy and people continued to believe that St. James and his disciples reposed, undisturbed in the holy cave and the Gallo-Roman sarcophagus of the pious Gaelic convert, the Lady Lupa. Nor were they substantially wrong in this, as we shall now see.

Since that month of alarm in 1589, no person, priest or layman, king or cardinal, was ever allowed, or ever ventured to approach and to see the crypt with its triple tomb. When Cardinal Paya, now Archbishop of Toledo, became, in January, 1874, Archbishop of Compostella, he formed the determination of doing for the body of St. James what has been effected in our days for the bodies of St. Francis of Assisi, St. Claire, Sts. Philip and James the younger, as well as St. Ambrose and St. Charles Borromeo,—namely, of re-opening solemnly their tombs, of verifying and attesting the condition of their hallowed remains.

An opportunity for this verification was afforded in Compostella by the ruinous state of certain portions of the cathedral around the high altar. The Cardinal-archbishop appointed a commission of eminent and enlightened clergymen and no less eminent physicians and scientists, who followed every step in the proceedings, recorded and signed them day by day.

It was known, from the annals of the Basilica, that the altar-tomb of the Apostle was placed exactly in the crypt beneath the high altar in the church above. An opening was, therefore, made in front of the high altar and the commissioners descended into the crypt at the foot of the Gallo-Roman sepulchre. This and the two adjoining tombs of St. Theodore and St. Athanasius, were found empty! Nay so much of the Gallo-Roman sarcophagus donated by Lupa, as could be, in a moment of extreme haste, taken away with the relics, had been removed with these.

The commission ordered every part of the adjoining ground to be searched to a depth of five or six feet. At length behind the Roman tomb itself, and in the very centre of the apse, workmen came upon a rudely constructed grave marked with a cross, and made up of the bricks and fragments of marble taken from the Gallo-Roman sepulchre. The hardened plaster which covered the fragments bore the impress of a hand in more than one place.

It was, manifestly, the work of some one who, urged on by some mortal fear, amid the darkness, and in secret, had been thus burying away some cherished treasure. Everything there was eloquent

of the hurried labor of love performed by the aged Archbishop San Clemente. They opened this rudely constructed grave, and only found a confused heap of human bones, without paper or inscription of any kind enabling the discoverers to say to whom these relics belonged.

Then began the scrupulously conscientious work of the physicians and scientists belonging to the commission. Every fragment in the heap was carefully set apart and sorted. After the most minute examination, it was ascertained that the fragments belonged to three skeletons of the male sex, one of them being somewhat older than the others, and offering several stains or marks not found on the corresponding pieces belonging to the other two. The skull of this older skeleton, which bore these peculiar stains and other distinctive characteristics,—was also incomplete. The mastoid bone was missing.

Now it so happened that Archbishop Gelmirez, who occupied the See of Compostella from July, 1100, to 1140, had sent to the Bishop and Chapter of Pistoia, in Italy, this very same missing portion of the skull of St. James; and in the course of the further investigation ordered in 1884 by Leo XIII., the Papal Commissioner, Monsignor Agostino Caprara, found on the portion of the skull still revered in the Cathedral of Pistoia, the characteristic stains and marks which distinguish the corresponding part of the older cranium in Compostella.¹

Cardinal Paya adhered rigorously to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent in investigations of this important nature. Having arrived, as well as the commissioners, at the conclusion that the three skeletons discovered, as we have just related, belonged to St. James the Elder and his two disciples, an authentic copy of the proceedings and conclusions was forwarded to the Sacred Congregation of Rites and laid before the Pope. His Holiness forthwith named a special committee of seven cardinals to examine and report on the matter. On May 20, 1884, the cardinals reported that several points mentioned in the Compostella investigation should be sifted more thoroughly. Thereupon Mgr. Agostino Caprara was directed to proceed at once to Spain as Special Commissioner of His Holiness, and to probe to the bottom every tittle of the evidence furnished by Cardinal Paya. The Papal Commissioners, says Leo XIII., in his bull, "having taken the sworn testimony of the witnesses summoned by him; having rec-

¹ The letter of Archbishop Gelmirez, copied from the original kept in the archives of the Cathedral of Compostella, is given by Don Zepedano at page 26 of his work. Superficial critics have no idea of the solid ground on which Leo XIII. and his cardinals advanced in every step which led to the publication of the Bull *Deus Omnipotens*.

onciled some apparent contradictions in their former testimony; having examined at Compostella and Madrid the professional experts in archæology, history, and anatomy, competent to decide on the matters inquired into; having carefully inspected the remaining parts of the more ancient (Gallo-Roman) sarcophagus, and compared them with the materials of the tomb which contained the discovered relics, as well as surveyed the part of the apse in which these were found; and, finally, having once more questioned the skilled anatomists regarding every portion of the venerated skeletons, the commissioner returned to Rome, and completed his labors by an accurate report of all that he had done.

"Wherefore, having once more called together in the Vatican the same Committee of Cardinals on the 19th July of the present year (1884), and a thorough discussion of every doubtful point resulting in a clearer manifestation of the truth, the question was put: 'Shall the judgment pronounced by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Compostella, regarding the identity of the relics discovered in the centre of the apse of the principal sanctuary of the said Metropolitan Basilica, and judged to belong to the Apostle James the Elder and to his two disciples, Athanasius and Theodore, be now confirmed . . . ?'

"And our Beloved Sons, the Cardinals aforesaid, together with the Prelates Consultors, considering that all the questions submitted to them were verified beyond the possibility of contradiction, and that, therefore, they had arrived at that certain knowledge of the subject-matter which, in conformity with the sacred canons and the constitutions of our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, is to be sought for in such inquiries, thus made answer: "*Affirmative, sen sententiam esse confirmandam.*"¹

Leo XIII., in order to revive throughout Christendom the ancient piety of our forefathers toward the shrine of St. James in Compostella, not only made of the year 1885 a jubilee year in Spain for all who visited the tomb of the Apostle, but extended to every diocese in the Catholic world the privilege of sharing the spiritual favors bestowed on pilgrims to Compostella.

Ever since the 25th of July, 1179, in virtue of a bull of Alexander III., it is a jubilee year in Compostella when the 25th of July, the feast of St. James, falls on Sunday. This happened in 1886, and will again happen only in 1897 within the present century. In the next century these jubilee years will be: 1909, 1915, 1920, 1926, 1937, 1943, 1948, 1954, 1965, 1971, 1976, 1982, 1993, 1999.

¹ Leonis XIII. . . . *Acta*, vol. iv., pp. 159-172.

This favor was conferred by Pope Calixtus II., and was confirmed by Eugene III., Anastasius IV., and Alexander III. Happy those among our readers whose age will permit them to look forward beyond the limits of the present century to the enjoyment of long years in the next. Thrice happy should devotion lead them to the ancient land of the Gael and the favored shrine of St. James on some future jubilee year. They will find in the "Field of the Star" and its inhabitants still living, ardent and bright with the light of other days, that faith which led Bishop Theodomir and Alfonso-the-Chaste to the blessed cave in the hillside of Libredon. Should our pilgrims boast of the old Celtic blood which warms the heart of the writer, they will remember, on crossing the waters of the deep Ulla, and climbing the steep iron pathway that leads thence to the *Campus Stellæ*, that among the first to whom St. James brought the Gospel truth in Spain, were those Gaels of the Asturias, and that it was a noble woman of that race who granted to the disciples of the martyred Apostle a resting-place in her own family sepulchre.

BERNARD O'REILLY.

¹ The inscription on the marble sarcophagus in which repose once more, since 1884, the relics of St. James, is as follows:

D. M. S.
 ATIANO. ET.AT
 TE.T LVMPA.
 VIRIA.EMO
 NEPTIS PIANO. XVI.
 ET S. F. C.

SOME AMERICAN NOVELS.¹

WHEN the American novelist writes about his art he takes himself very seriously. And he should; for the novel has become the most powerful literary factor in our civilization. Nobody attempts to teach through the theatre. With us the theatre is a place of amusement—nothing more. Our essayists are very charming, very exquisite, but they produce only light flagree work. Take the latest essays of Colonel Higginson and Miss Repplier, and they have made English prose almost as clear, as plastic, as perfect as that of the French, and you have all manner of delightful pleasantries; they make literature; they are simpler than Addison and more witty than Steele, and their style fits their subjects like a glove; but one longs for even the air of intensity, which is so characteristically Emersonian: for the solid things one must go back to Bacon and Montaigne.

The novel has come to be the most serious expression of the literature of the nineteenth century. Nobody writes sermons now except to deliver them—which is a pity. We have become such slaves of the types that we must verify everything we hear, and a sermon loses a large part of its force by not appearing in print.

Wiseman and Newman were quick to see the mission of the novel; and to-day Miss Austen need not have made a defense of it. It is no longer "light"—but how could Samuel Richardson or Miss Burney ever have been considered "light?"—no longer a tale of sentiment to be apologized for. Wm. D. Howells, or Mr. Crawford, or Mr. Thomas Hardy, or Mr. Richard Blackmore, write of the modern novel as Miss Austen wrote in the incomparable "Northanger Abbey."

"Although," she writes, "our productions have afforded more extensive and unaffected pleasure than any other literary compositions in the world, no species of composition has been so much decried. From pride, ignorance or fashion, our foes are almost as many as our readers; and, while the abilities of the nine-hundredth abridger of the "History of England," or of the man who collects and publishes in a volume some dozen lines of Milton, Pope or Prior, with a paper from the *Spectator*, and a chapter from Sterne, are eulogized by a thousand pens, there seems almost a general wish to decry the capacity and undervalue the labor of the

¹ *Saracenesca, Sant' Ilario*, etc., by F. Marion Crawford; Macmillan & Co., New York.

novelist, and to slight the performances which have only genius, wit and taste to recommend them." "A good novel is only some work in which the greatest powers of the mind are displayed, in which the most thorough knowledge of human nature, the happiest delineations of its varieties, the liveliest effusions of wit and humor are conveyed to the world in the best chosen language."

It must be admitted that the English novelists do not take themselves as seriously as the Americans. They are less self-conscious, but more self-satisfied. They do not seem to bother as to whether they are idealists or novelists. One of them, Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson, takes the lowest view of his art, though he is the most artistic of them all. Messrs. Howells and James are French rather than English in their ideas of their art—ethical disciples of Flaubert rather than of Thackeray. But their realism—thank God! has nothing in common with the naturalism of the French school of novelists. Mr. Howells, whose practise of his art is much greater than his theories, would teach and photograph; Mr. James would dissect and etch; Mr. Marion Crawford paints without seeming to trouble himself about methods or schools. Neither Mr. Howells nor Mr. James has the great manner of Mr. Crawford; but they are incapable of such uneven work. Their brush-marks may sometimes be slight, and they may seem to have no conceptions worthy of any brush-work at all, but it is all even, smooth, technically good. Mr. Howells has never written anything very bad, nor has Mr. James. Mr. Crawford has written the best novel ever produced by an American, and the worst. The one is "Saracenesca," the other "An American Politician."

Mr. Crawford has violent admirers and violent detractors. By some he is exalted, by others depressed. But the worst thing about him is that he writes too much. Again, one may say that the fact that he writes so much shows that his admirers are many and clamorous for more. But, although the taste of the elect and that of the public always join in acclaiming the right thing when time has mellowed it, he who considers the crowds first loses their suffrages in the end.

It is not pardonable to say much, without his permission, about the life of a man still in the flesh. It is enough to say that he was born at the Baths of Lucca, in 1854; that he is the son of Thomas Crawford, the sculptor, and the nephew of Julia Ward Howe; that he was trained with care, and at Cambridge, Heidelberg and the University of Rome pursued special studies with great zeal; that, returning to America, he took a course of Sanscrit and Greek. He had attempted newspaper work in India, and contributed papers on philosophies of various kinds to the reviews, when, having told some glowing Oriental tales to his uncle,

Mr. Samuel Ward, that gentleman—whose good taste in all things became an American proverb before he died—suggested to Mr. Crawford that he ought to write a novel. In "The Three Fates," which is Mr. Crawford's latest novel but one, he tells us of the experiences of a young man of letters in New York. How much of this is his own experience, who can tell? Novelists mix things so. When they seem to be most realistic, they are often most idealistic. They will no more stick to a cut-and-dry plot or to their own experiences than Euripides or Sophocles would have stuck to the classic and iron-clad rules which the great Aristotle formulated. Have we not been made to believe, of late, that Horace Skimpole was not Leigh Hunt, after all? That Anthony Trollope knew nothing of the lives of English clergymen, in spite of "Barchester Towers" and "The Warden;" that Miss Fotheringay was not the actress Miss O'Neil, and that Thackeray evolved the delicious "De Floracs" from his inner consciousness? And so, it is hard to tell how far the experience of George Wood in "The Three Fates" is from life. At any rate, it is the experience of many honorable and well-educated young men who feel an impulse towards the pursuit of literature. Mr. Crawford's hero begins by reviewing books at the rate of half a cent a word: He does it energetically and earns his money. He is affected with the delusion of young newspaper writers that the contributor, or even the editor, controls the policy of the paper without regard to the business department. George Wood learns by sad experience—the reduction of his revenue—that the book reviser on a daily paper must adapt himself to more tastes than one. And from this young gentleman's revelation about modern journalism, one may conclude that the Catholic writer or reporter on a great daily paper has no more power to express his real sentiments, when the policy of the paper is against them, than a fly has on the circulation of a wheel. He has his choice—to remain powerless or to drop off. Doyle, the admirable contributor to *Punch*, did the latter when the policy of that paper became seriously anti-Papal; and Freeman, the late historian, followed his example when the *Saturday Review* undertook to support the English policy of helping the unspeakable Turk. A Catholic who undertakes book reviews must accept the policy of his paper, and whether Huxley's latest views or Daudet's last novel, or a reprint of Schopenhauer be under discussion, he must take the cue from his editor, or resign. It is appropriate here to remark that the man who owns the largest share in the newspaper is the man that controls its policy; it is a question of money—and, so long as it is a question of money, the hope—indulged in by the inexperienced—that the professedly Catholic paper will soon no longer be a necessity, is fallacious.

"The Three Fates," is not after Marion Crawford's strongest manner. The style is not up to the perfection of much of his writing. It has the quality of nature, human interest. George Wood discovers that newspaper criticism is not his vocation. He finds this out in a characteristically American way. Original work pays better, and henceforth Mr. George Wood resolves that he will no longer be a critic, for he was born to be criticized. There is truth in Mr. Crawford's picture of the life of the young college-bred man of letters in New York. The disgust of the hero's father, who has failed irretrievably in business, when he finds that his son will obey his impulse to write, is well done, and the effects of this impulse on the son's life are equally well described. Mr. Crawford must have felt it; the dogged determination of this man who does not mistake the desire to write, for the gift of expression has never been better described. George Wood works on, discouraged, faltering, but persevering until he finds his *métier*, which is novel-writing. In no other city is talent and energy of any sort more quickly recognized than in New York, and George Wood's success after he has written his first book contains no element of exaggeration in it. There are some graphic passages on the difference between the newspaper man and the literary man. The editor—especially the night editor—is *sui generis*, and there is nothing in common between him and the man of letters, pure and simple. The editor, as Mr. Crawford hints, may be a man of letters, but he is a man of letters out of his element, and with a new set of very unliterary faculties developed. Mr. Crawford's presentment of the hardships of the young reviewer, who wants to be bold and honest according to his lights, is very realistic. It is not quite fair, however, to say that all books must be reviewed in a daily journal with an eye to the advertisement column.

The sentimental part of "The Three Fates" is not entirely satisfactory. Everybody familiar with social New York will recognize how true are Mr. Crawford's types. Constance, whom one respects in the beginning, is a disappointment. Mamie is well-drawn,—in fact, she is too well-drawn to be pleasant,—and Grace is rather too greatly over-weighted with common sense to be interesting. These are the three fates, and yet the novel cannot be said to have a heroine. It is one of the few books by Mr. Crawford which one reads a second time with more pleasure than the first, in spite of the rather coarse outlines of Mamie's mother, who is a rather underbred woman of society, realistically presented without any fuss about realism.

Mr. Crawford understands and loves best Italy. He has elected to live at Sorrento, and, as he is now a Catholic, the one barrier which prevented Robert Browning and so many other men of

genius from getting near to the Italians and the meaning of Italian history and social life, has been removed. He is cosmopolitan, as he ought to be, with such an education and such wide experiences and tastes; and he is versatile. But he satisfies our heart and intellect most when he takes us to the land of the orange and myrtle. His Italy is very different from the Italy of "The Marble Faun." There we have New Englandism in an Italian environment; there is no touch of the doctrinaire,—of Madame de Stael's philosophizing in it. Nor is it the rococco Italy of that more recent book, Mr. Fuller's "Chevalier Pensieri-Vani." One feels that it is the real thing, and that one is safe in Mr. Crawford's hands. When Mr. Crawford leads us into his own country or into England, one does not feel so safe. If he ever writes a novel of English society, it will have a touch of D'Israeli, and we shall revel in tinsel and diamonds and eat with abnormally stately duchesses off gold plate. This love of splendor and the terribly romantic does not hamper him in the country of Saracenesca, of Marzio, of Nino, and, besides, every now and then he finds a vent for his impulses in romances which neither shock our tastes nor our sense of the probable. In "Paul Patoff" he lays his scene in Constantinople. Now anything may happen in Constantinople. It is hard to believe that a mother can hate her son so desperately as to try to kill him twice. An unnatural hate, like that, cannot be treated successfully even by the highest genius. Who, for instance, does not feel that Shakespeare's Regan and Goneril come as near to being failures as any characters from his hand could be? Mr. Crawford makes us forget the repulsiveness of his study of a mother's hatred by the splendor of his descriptions of Turkish life, and indulges his tastes for adventures of the "Arabian Nights'" kind to his heart's content. We never think of blaming him for improbabilities, and we must admit his wonderful power as a narrator; but when he makes the abnormal repulsive simply because he does not sufficiently think his story out before he plunges into it, we do begin to blame him. This fault, however, is the result of quick production. It shows worst in "The Witch of Prague," where, too, we find a phrase or two which sound unorthodox.

In "Zoroaster" he again sets fire to his oriental torch, and it blazes away magnificently. Mr. Crawford calls "Zoroaster" a drama, and dedicates it to his wife. It would indeed make a telling drama, but no stage setting could supply the place of the jewelled and luxurious yet simple style of this book. As in "A Roman Singer," he touches a perfection of style which he finally reaches in his "With the Immortals." In considering the rather commonplace and certainly careless manner of "The Three Fates," and the coarse verbiage of "An American Politician," one finds it difficult

to believe that Mr. Crawford did not trust the verbal part of the two latter entirely to his typewriter. His touch is firm, and his color glowing in "Zoroaster." It is the outcome of those Oriental studies in which he has taken so much interest. Few men have written such rhythmical prose as we find in this book. The figure of Daniel the Prophet is a very noble one, and the bursts of Persian lyrics in it not unworthy of a book which needed only a more pronounced poetical form to be ranked almost epically high. Another dip into the most iris-hued wave of romance is "Khaled," a short Arabian tale of one of the genii who could only obtain a soul when the woman for whom he left "his place in the third Heaven of precious stones" should learn to love him. One of Mr. Crawford's characteristic touches is where, after Khaled has gained a soul, he faces the mob that had burst into the palace. "If any man wishes to take my life," he cried, "let him come and take it. And the sword they all knew in battle began to make a storm of lightning about his head in the morning sun." It has been often said that no experience is useless to a man; it has proved so in Mr. Crawford's case. He is not yet forty years of age. "Mr. Isaacs," his first novel, appeared in 1882, and he has touched on many subjects with a versatility which is not without defects, but which shows no weakness. The worst that can be said of him so far is that he is not equal to himself.

It is easy to understand why "Mr. Isaacs" became popular. It had an air of real experience; it possessed that new flavor which both the novel-reader and the talker about literature eagerly welcome; its style was easy, graceful, modulated, clear, and though the author had not much of a story to tell, his manner of telling in modern daylight of wonders that are supposed to be only proper to weird and mysterious surroundings, was very fascinating. Besides, the new "fad" of theosophy had begun to attract attention. The American who had not found Positivism or the hot-water cure or the blue-glass mania satisfactory, was delighted to learn more about the "astral body" and the Buddhist adepts. The hero of the book, Mr. Isaacs, is a well-known Indian dealer in jewels, whose lawsuit this year with a native prince has recently excited much attention in the English press.

Mr. Crawford knew very well that, in introducing the mysterious Mr. Isaacs to Americans, he had them at his mercy, and he took advantage of it. A romancer is not obliged to explain anything; he describes phenomena—that is all. When Ram Dal, the interesting Buddhist adept, disappears suddenly from the room, presumably going through the wall, Mr. Isaacs and his friend coolly take their sherbert and smoke their pipes, and give the impression that the adept in India frequently goes out in that manner.

"We live," says Mr. Isaacs, "in a land where marvels are common enough. Who has explained the basket trick, or the mango trick, or the man who throws a rope up into the air and then climbs up it, and takes the rope after him, disappearing into blue space? And yet you have seen those things—I have seen them, everyone has seen them—and the performers claim no supernatural agency or assistance. It is merely a difference of degrees, whether you make a mango grow from the seed to the tree in half an hour, or whether you transport yourself ten thousand miles in as many seconds, possibly through walls of brick and stone, on your way astonishing some ordinary mortal by showing that you know all about his affairs."

Mr. Isaacs explains that the Buddhist adepts, who deny that they have either the special help of God or of the devil, in their "phenomena," propose to obtain happiness by means of wisdom, which is a knowledge of the world in the broadest sense of the phrase; this knowledge they hope to get by reading finite results through "a clever use of the infinite."

One is reminded of the subdivisions of the winds and their colors in the old Brehon laws—where the south wind, by the way, was purple—by the statement Mr. Isaacs makes of the subtle division the Buddhists make of sound, which they invariably connect with shades of colors in the rainbow; they believe that the bond between the body and the soul can be so attenuated by asceticism that the soul can be free to roam where it pleases. It would seem, after all, that the Buddhist is quite willing to be annihilated after he has once satisfied his curiosity about everything. This is rather a low ideal, after all, in spite of the high-sounding claims of the Theosophists. But Mr. Crawford does not teach; he simply strives to be interesting and amusing; one cannot help imagining how D'Israeli would have revelled in his hero, and in the mock-supernaturalism of Theosophy. Mr. Crawford has D'Israeli's love of splendor, but he shows no second-hand "goods," and his diamonds are all real.

Mr. Crawford has avoided those subjects which make Mr. Mallock's attempts to write fiction so nasty. Only in "To Leeward" has he made the motive of many of the novels of our cousins, the French, the principal factor in a story. There we have a study of a young woman—a very modern young woman—who reads Kant, and struggles with Kant's statement, that "Nothing is the same as Being." She has been badly brought up, but she is not actively bad; she is "odd," she begins by being very strong-minded, and ends by being very weak-minded. She marries the Marchese Marcantonio, who is one of those Roman aristocrats, effete, noble, melancholy, slow, whom Mr. Crawford delights in.

In fact, Mr. Crawford is most at home in an artificial society. If he ever lays the scene of a novel in the Fauburg St. Germain, it will have the grand air of Octave Feuillet, and the rarefied atmosphere of Mrs. Craven. Diana, Marcantonio's sister, is a fine type of the great lady—one can see that religious principle lies behind the best qualities of her thought and conduct—pure, high-minded, full of self-respect, and yet not haughty.

“ Daughter of the gods, divinely fair, and most divinely tall.”

Julius Batiscombe, the novelist, is a despicable creature, whose aim in life is to make women love him—by a pretence of love on his part. Mr. Crawford treats him too gently. He is a cad; but he succeeds in eloping with Marcantonio's wife, who becomes contemptibly frivolous, and whose death, while she is screening her lover from the pistol-ball of her husband, does not even give her dignity. We perceive that she is a weak person, who needed all the safeguards of the Catholic Church to save her from her own lightness of character, but who fails for lack of strong religious support. Mr. Crawford probably intended to teach a moral; but if it be not this it is invisible. This heroine had no reason to exist in fiction, for she is no better than the thistle-down heroines of “Frou-Frou” and “Le Sphynx”—stagnant creatures, with no human element in them, except the distorted opinion that temptation implies the doctrine of non-resistance. Nevertheless, there are clever passages in the book; and in it we find the germ of “Saracenesca”; for, Corona is after all, Diana carefully thought out. A half-dozen essayists could set up a reputation for brilliancy on the bits of wisdom and wit which Mr. Crawford flings off with that ease which is so lacking in the other maker of epigrams, Mr. George Meredith, now the reigning favorite in circles of culture. Crawford is seldom really humorous; sometimes his wit has a touch of flippancy which does not improve it. “Surely,” he says, describing the ball in “To Leeward,” “without a waltz the world would have lacked a very divine element. Few people can really doubt what the step was that David danced before the ark.” This is an appeal to the gallery with a vengeance. The special manner of his clever phrases is well shown in this: “The people who can help others, are the strong ones who can catch them just below the shoulder by the arm and support them and push them to land, themselves doing all the work. That is a watery simile, but most similes are but water, and can be poured into a tea-cup or into a bucket—they will take the shape of either.”

In “Dr. Claudius” we breathe pure air once again. Claudius is a fine fellow, with all the tenderness and truth of the North;

and the Countess Margaret is one of those noble women who do not do anything great, but seem capable of all greatness. In these Mr. Crawford delights. The scene opens in Heidelberg, which, he says, is a place of little learning. Here we find the prelude to his later and greater novel of "Greiffenstein." There are Americans in this novel, and there is a very affectionate and reverential picture of the author's uncle, Mr. Samuel Ward, "as the uncle of all the world." The Duke and his sister, the Lady Victoria, are exceedingly pleasant people. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is credited with having said that Queen Victoria might without doubt be admitted to any family circle in America. One may say the same thing of Mr. Crawford's aristocrats and prelates; usually, in novels, they are people that no respectable American would care to know, however well conducted they may be in real life. What a relief it is to find a Cardinal in a novel who is without designs on the virtuous Protestant! Ever since Webster wrote his lugubrious "Dutchess of Malfi," Cardinals on the English stage, and in the English novels, have, as a rule, not been presentable to decent society. Fortunately, the English-reading public has had every reason in the last few years to get over its prejudice against the prelate of Webster, Browning, and even Bulwer. How delightful, then, was it to meet something like the real men in "Marzio's Crucifix" and "Saracenesca." We had not had such Cardinals in fiction since the great Borromeo was limned in "The Betrothed," by Manzoni. The Americans in "Dr. Claudius" are Americans seen from the outside, except in "The Three Fates"—and, even there, there is a suspicion of it. Mr. Crawford looks at America and Americans from the outside. Mr. Barker, for instance, is photographed, but nothing more; he had a good social position in New York, his photographer says, for "although he was not Dutch, he had been born in Salem, Massachusetts." In "Dr. Claudius" we begin to notice a peculiarity about his heroine's eyes which grows on him until, in his latest novel, "Don Orsino,"—now running in the *Atlantic Monthly*—he dares to expect us to admire a prima donna who has yellow eyes, with a squint; and he coolly tells us that "Orsino fancied that one eye or the other wandered a very little, but he could not tell which; the slightest obliquity made the glance disquieting and yet attractive." Margaret, in "Dr. Claudius," has eyes of "burning amber." But there is one redeeming trait, which neither Mr. Howells nor Mr. James has, and which Mr. Crawford possesses—he is always in love with his heroines, and "all the world loves a lover." His analyses of love are manly; and there is a picture of the modern young man, and his attitude towards pure affection, on page 26 of "Dr. Claudius," which is very nobly done. "Englishmen," he says, "are rarely heroic lovers, except

in their novels. There is generally a little by-path of caution, a postern-gate of mercantile foresight, by which they can slip quietly out at the right moment and forget all about the whole thing." "No man, living or dead, has ever understood any woman for five minutes at a time." "There is a tone in some voices," he says, "which seems to have a power of perpetuating itself and rebounding among the alcoves of our recollections. Rarely, very rarely, singers possess it, and even though their powers be limited, there comes a strange thrill into their singing which fixes it indelibly on the memory."

For delightful bits about music and singing, one must go to "*A Roman Singer*," the most artistic, the most quaint of all Marion Crawford's novels, and the most sympathetic as well. "One cannot argue with singers," says the charming old professor who tells the story of his ward, Nino, in the most characteristic phrases. Like all Mr. Crawford's heroes, Nino is honest, pure-minded and straightforward. His love for the Baroness von Lira is like that of Orlando for Rosalind—very sudden and equally idyllic. The charm of the novel lies in the character of the old professor, and it reads like an interpretation by Mr. Crawford of a simple document, written in a dialect which is not quite the language of Dante or Selvio Pellico; not, in fact, the literary language of the Italians. It is steeped in local color; it is racy of the Roman soil, and of the narrow, shrewd, kindly and artistic type—the Roman bourgeois who had been a noble, but whose life is now bounded by pretty economies of oil and olives and fowl, that he may have syrup of violets occasionally with his dear ward, Nino, and his own wine from the little vineyard he has bought with his savings. "I was fond of my old self, but I did not respect him much. And my present self I respect without fondness. Is that metaphysics? Who knows? It is vanity, in either case, and the vanity of self-respect is perhaps a more dangerous thing than the vanity of self-love, though you may call it pride, perhaps, or give it any other high-sounding title. But the heart of a vain man is lighter than the heart of the proud."

"*A Roman Singer*" is idyllic, poetical, and a masterpiece of simplicity. In these Italian novels, or romances—for Mr. Crawford belongs to the romantic school—he redeems Americans abroad from the charge of stupidity and ignorance which Hawthorne's "*Marble Faun*" brought upon them. Who, with a heart and taste, does not admire Hawthorne's exquisite romance? But what Catholic can control his indignation at some of the grotesque misunderstandings and misstatements in that book? There is a bit of exaggeration in the first chapter of "*A Roman Singer*," where Nino, at the benediction, bows—not towards the

tabernacle, but to the Baroness von Lira, whom he has just met. It shocks the reverent.

There is an element of romantic simplicity in Crawford's better novels—especially in "A Roman Singer"—that reminds one of the methods of Shakespeare's comedies. The best of our modern novels are lineal descendants from Shakespeare and the romantic dramatists of the Elizabethan epoch. The novel is as much the literary expression of our time as the drama was that of the Elizabethan; and to lessons learned so well from Shakespeare, we owe the present perfection of the novel. The admirers of De Balzac have made a fetich of him; but our one American, who has been more influenced by him than by Shakespeare, has surpassed him. If one compares "César Berotteau" with "Silas Lapham," or "Eugenie Grandet" with "The Quality of Mercy," we shall be forced to find that, in spite of literary superstition, Mr. Howells' realism is more sane and healthy than that of the Frenchman, and his talent not less powerful.

But Mr. Crawford is romantic—not realistic; and that may be one reason why some of our literary high priests, whose deities are Tolstoi and Ibsen, look coldly on him. In "Marzio's Crucifix," which is not so quaint or idyllic as "A Roman Singer," but which is as true to nature as the colors of the Japanese or the notes of birds are true, Mr. Crawford makes a careful study of two elements on which the future of Europe depends. Marzio is at once an artist and an anarchist, and we have a masterly analysis of the anarchistic point of view, and also of the Roman popular point of view. Again, one feels safe in Mr. Crawford's hands. He is not likely to put foolish opinions into the mouths of Catholics merely for the sake of effect; he knows too much for that. The Cardinal, for instance, talks and acts with a dignity of his position; he possesses what Matthew Arnold would call "lucidity." The good priest, Don Paolo, has all the good qualities and naturalness of Manzoni's¹ curate, without his cowardice; and the love story which runs through the book is very pure and honest. The Romans, Mr. Crawford says, reverence a Cardinal, no matter whether they be affected with the superstitious worship of Italy or not, and they look on the Florentine and the Piedmontese as foreigners. Marzio, a type of the Continental free-thinker, reasons about the murder of his brother, Don Paolo, whom he hates:

"Since there was no soul," he thought, "there was no absolute right or wrong, and everything must be decided by the standard of expediency. It was a mistake to allow people to murder one another openly, of course, because people of less intellectual

¹ I Promessi Sposi.

capacity would take upon themselves to judge such cases in their own way. But provided that public morality, the darling of the free-thinker, was not scandalized, there would be no inherent wrong in doing away with Paolo. On the contrary, his death would be a benefit to the community at large (since he was a priest), and be an advantage to Marzio in particular. Not a pecuniary advantage, either, for in Marzio's strange system there would have been an immorality in murdering Paolo for his money, if he had ever had any, though it seemed right enough to kill him for an idea. This is, to a great extent, the code of those persons who believe in nothing but what they call great ideas. The individuals who murdered the Czar would doubtless have scrupled to rob a gentleman in the street of ten francs. Marzio said to himself that to get rid of Paolo would be to emancipate himself and his family from the rule and interference of a priest, and that such a proceeding was only the illustration, on a small scale, of what he desired for his country; consequently, it was just, and therefore it ought to be done."

No comment is necessary; Marzio is a type, and Mr. Crawford has logically followed the reasoning of the type which acknowledges neither God nor master, and which adores ideas. The conversation between the Cardinal and Don Paolo, where the priest fears that the lovely chalices and crucifixes carved by his infidel brother may be unfit for the service of the Church, is characteristic and true. "Their use sanctifies them," the Cardinal says, "not the moral goodness of the artist. For, by your own argument, you would otherwise be committing a sin if we did not find out the most saintly men and set them to silver-chiselling instead of consecrating them bishops and archbishops. It would take a long time to build a church if you only employed masons who were in the state of grace."

The conversion of Marzio, through his masterpiece, the crucifix, is rather sudden—almost as sudden as the change in Orlando's brother, in "As You Like It." But, as Marzio himself says, perhaps it was a miracle.

It would take too much space to analyze "Greiffenstein" adequately. It is not so vivid or so strong as "Saracenesca;" the characters do not grip us so firmly, but it is an important contribution to literature; and from it one gets a clear idea of where the strength of the German social body lies. In it Mr. Crawford makes thorough use of his experience in the German universities.

"With the Immortals" is a fantasy. It reminds one both of Mallock's "New Republic" and of Walter Savage Landor's "Imaginary Conversations." In style it equals both. It has the grace and "modernity" of Mallock, and the learning, without the

perversity, of Landor. It is a masterpiece of English, and almost French in the perfection of its form. It is a fantasia of grace, and cleverness and brilliancy. One may pick it up at any time and find a thought which suggests much; or, perhaps, something that will irritate one's mind, as the little foreign substance irritates the oyster and produces a pearl. This series of conversations with Henry of Navarre, Cromwell, Julius Cæsar, Dr. Johnson—and many others of the elder men brought back to life—has given the author his real place in literature; for "With the Immortals," judged by every rule, *is* literature.

"Saracenesca," "Sant Ilario" and "Don Orsino" go together. Don Orsino is the son of Saracenesca and Corona, the noblest of Mr. Crawford's heroines. "The Witch of Prague" and a "Cigarette Maker's Romance" are studies in mental peculiarities. The former is a sensational, hypnotic phantasmagoria, without any human interest, and as terrible and as brutally dramatic as Webster's "Duchess of Malfi." "A Cigarette Maker's Romance" is sane and interesting. "A Tale of a Country Parish" is a slight story brilliantly told, but which there was no special reason to tell.

"Saracenesca" is a great novel, and the author of it need only be equal to himself to be the greatest of American novelists. Mr. W. E. Norris, the English novelist, has been compared to Thackeray, but Mr. Crawford has more power and a broader range than Mr. Norris. Space again prevents an analysis of "Saracenesca." It is a picture of phases of life which have never been truly painted before, because there was no painter worthy of the work. The Italian would have been prejudiced or influenced by the French naturalistic school or his politics; another foreigner would not have understood it. But Mr. Crawford has understood; he has followed the instincts of genius and the promptings of reason. He shows Rome as it was just before the spoliation. He is not a special pleader, but a sound artist; an artist who can think, and whose colors are laid on with the firmness of intelligence. "Sant Ilario" lacks something of the grandeur and delicacy of "Saracenesca," of which it is a sequel; and we cannot judge of "Don Orsino" until it appears as a whole. The description of the Pope's jubilee in the first chapters shows that Mr. Crawford has not lost that grasp of details and of masses which make his descriptions of great functions splendid and unique.

One cannot predict what Mr. Marion Crawford may do. It is certain, however, that he has produced in "Saracenesca" one of the most satisfactory works of fiction in our language. It is unfortunate that his education and experience preclude him from painting American life with the truth and clearness of his Italian pictures.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

THE REGENTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK AND CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

AT the request of the Most Rev. Editor of the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY, the writer here attempts to place before the readers of the REVIEW a brief history of the Regent-system of the State of New York, and its relation to our Catholic Schools. He would gladly have left the subject to be treated by some one more competent to give to the public a comprehensive outline of this institution, and its bearings upon Catholic education. To understand its nature and scope we shall trace it from the broad stream of its present existence to the small rills of its early beginnings.

The University of the State of New York is an organization which, as it now stands, includes several of the incorporated colleges of the State, together with a number of incorporated academies, and academical public and private schools. The governing body of this university is a Board of Regents, composed in part of State officers, who are regents *ex officio*, and, in part, of members elected by the State legislature in the same manner that senators of the United States are elected. Their functions are those of supervision and inspection—not of instruction.

The original idea was supposed to be akin to that of the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which are composed of separate and independent colleges. The colleges under the regents, however, were not established in the same locality, but were distributed through the State, as circumstances seemed to call for them. Certain parts of this original plan proved impracticable, and many changes were introduced by subsequent legislatures. The original act creating the university was passed by the legislature May 1, 1784, at the close of the Revolutionary war. It was in response to a very strong appeal from Governor George Clinton, in his annual message. He saw the necessity of doing something for education. Private schools were languishing; the King's College had been broken up during the war and its property confiscated. The legislature promptly responded, and the Regents of the State of New York were incorporated as the governing body of King's College, which had been revived under the name of Columbia College, together with all other institutions of the kind which the regents might deem proper to establish.

Experience, however, very soon proved that a body constituted like this board, of men scattered over a sparsely settled State, could not be assembled for business except on very urgent occa-

sions. Three years later, an act was passed which substantially created the university as it now exists. It bears upon it the stamp of that great genius, Alexander Hamilton. His design was to include the whole system of education—primary, academic, and collegiate—under the regents, giving to it the strength and vigor which would result from local government under a strong, central supervisory department. If this idea had been carried out, the school question for Catholics might have been solved long ago, as denominational schools would have been admitted to their share of the public funds.

This bill authorized the regents to visit and inspect all colleges, academies, and schools, which were established, and which might be established in the State; to examine into the condition of education and discipline; and to make a yearly report thereof to the legislature. It empowered them to confer the highest scholastic degrees, to charter colleges and academies, and to grant collegiate charters to such academies as might grow to be worthy of them.

Besides the provisions relating to the university, the act ratified and confirmed the charter of Columbia College, named a board of trustees, and invested it with power to hold property, with all other rights and powers possessed under the charter of 1784. It thus laid down the principle, which has since been adhered to in the State of New York, that the university should include and have the inspection of all the colleges and academies of the State, but that each should have its own board of trustees, who should constitute a body corporate for the management of its individual affairs. The first meeting of this new board was held July the 19th, 1789, at the Exchange, in New York city. Governor Clinton was then chosen Chancellor. At this meeting, the first application was made by an academy in the State for a charter, which was granted in the following November. This institution still survives under the name of Erasmus Hall, Flatbush, and is a living memento of the first board of regents. The same year the Clinton Academy, Oneida county, received its charter. Then followed Union College, at Schenectady, in 1795.

Passing over, without mention, many years of inaction and routine work, we come nearer to our own times. In the year 1846, new powers were granted to the regents. By an act of the legislature they were made trustees of the State Library, and of the State Museum of Natural History. They were authorized, at their discretion, to confer the highest honorary degrees; to appoint boards of Medical Examiners, and, on their recommendation, to confer the degree of M.D. They held examinations, and granted certificates to legal studies. Their examinations also determined the standard of academic institutions throughout the State. They

were empowered to be the custodians of the historical documents of the State, and of certain legislative documents. This position they still hold. They maintain a duplicate department of important documents, and conduct the publication and distribution of State works of the highest scientific character. They have charge of the investigation of State boundaries, and the restoring of monuments along their lines. From all institutions subject to their visitations they require an annual report under oath; and, for sufficient cause, they may alter, amend, or repeal the charter of any institution incorporated according to the laws of the State of New York.

The university is not well known or fully understood, owing to the fact that, in its present condition, it is unlike our usually received idea of a university. It lacks the charms of local traditions and associations that cling to the universities of the Middle Ages. It has not its multitudes of students, drawn from all lands by the fame of celebrated teachers, and its clusters of venerable and historic buildings, standing in an atmosphere of repose, proud of their ancient traditions. We might find, however, in our State university some remote resemblance to the English and Continental universities, inasmuch as their various colleges, independent in their government, were united in a common life by means of their uniform examinations. What the London University does to-day for every young man who submits to its examinations, without requiring residence or attendance upon special lecture courses, is granted by our university to all the studious youth in the Empire State. For her highest degree she requires only success in her examinations. These examinations are thorough and severe, and a degree thus obtained is respected by the best educational institutions of the land. It is truly what President Gilman calls "a supervisory university with the crowning power of conferring degrees. A Chancellor is not the president of a body of teachers, but a chairman of a body of trustees." It has two important functions; one is the management of an immense system of academic administration, the other comprehends the duty of stimulating higher educational efforts. It acts upon the academies through its system of preliminary and academic examinations, making the distribution of State aid dependent upon conformity to the requirements of a rigid but reasonable examination. Its influence upon the colleges lies in the raised standard of preliminary and academic courses of studies, in this manner providing for the colleges a more advanced and riper class of pupils.

Thus we have, in the University of the State of New York, not indeed a few time-honored institutions, such as cluster around Oxford and Louvain, but colleges, academies, and schools which

number about four hundred, located in almost every county of the Empire State, doling out the blessings of a liberal education. Chancellor Pruyn, in his address of 1878 to the Convocation, said: "The University of the State of New York, though generally regarded as a legal fiction, is a truth of grand reality. The numerous institutions of which it is composed are not, as in England, crowded into a single city, but are scattered for popular convenience, over the entire State."

Another valuable feature of the system is the Convocation, in which the regents and officers of all the colleges, academies, and normal schools, within the State take part. In no other State is such an assembly to be found. In no other State, do teachers and officers of colleges and academies, irrespective of creed, meet annually to deliberate upon the condition and progress, the aims and principles, the spirit and methods, of secondary and higher education. The sessions are held in the month of July, during which time papers are read, experimental measures are discussed, degrees are conferred, and individual views exchanged.

To direct such a complex and all-important institution, the men known as the regents must be of the best and the highest intelligence; and, as a rule, such they are. They may not shine as brightly as the members of the French Academy, yet the national University of France has many points in common with the regents of the State of New York. Both seek to control primary and intermediate as well as superior education. Assuredly, the regents of the present day must differ from the popular idea which had been well expressed by the present Chancellor, Mr. George William Curtis, in his address of 1890: "The regent of fifty years ago was supposed to be a venerable figure; either bald or gray-headed, of irreproachable respectability, and inexpressible pomp of manner, whose tottering steps were aided by a gold-headed cane, whose mysterious office was uncomprehended, if not incomprehensible, and whose aspect altogether might suggest a fossilized functionary of the paleozoic period." A glance at the long list of distinguished men who have filled these high positions for upwards of a century, is sufficient proof of the efficiency and value of their work. They deserve well of the State, and should have the hearty support and sympathy of the people.

Several of our Catholic colleges have been corporate portions of the university for many years, though they have no share in the literature fund, as none but secondary schools have this privilege.

The first Catholic academy to be chartered was St. Mary's Institute, Amsterdam, New York. This new departure took place about eight years ago. It was then considered an innovation,

and received much adverse criticism ; but its grand success has silenced the critics. A year or two later two of the leading Catholic schools in our central city made application for charters, but they encountered a great difficulty which, for a time, threatened to extinguish the hope entertained by earnest educators of obtaining something that might bring them nearer to a settlement, by which they might obtain their long delayed rights from the State. Objection was made in certain quarters that the State could not pay over money for school purposes to the principals of Catholic schools, who were also pastors of their respective churches, as by so doing there would be an appearance of a union of church and State. The difficulty was referred to the Hon. Francis Kernan, of Utica, who has been for many years a regent ; and, to his credit, be it said, that though in feeble health, he studied the question until a satisfactory solution suggested itself, whereby we were enabled to have our Syracuse schools chartered. Since then a great change has taken place ; new interest has been awakened ; the workings of the regent-system have been carefully studied, and many of the leading schools have been chartered. The following schools have been fully admitted to the University : the academies of Albany and Troy, under the charge of the Christian Brothers ; Mount St. Vincent, on the Hudson, under the charge of the Sisters of Charity ; the academies in charge of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, at Manhattanville, Albany and Rochester ; St. Mary's Academy, Ogdensburg ; D'Youleville Academy, Plattsburgh ; Visitation Institute, Brooklyn ; Holy Angels' Academy, Buffalo ; La Salle Institute, Troy ; Mount St. Mary's Academy, Newburgh ; St. Bernard's Academy, Cohoes ; St. Joseph's Academy, Flushing ; St. Joseph's Academy, Lockport ; St. Peter's Academy, Rome ; St. Peter's Academy, Troy ; St. Joseph's Academy, Albany ; St. Patrick's Academy, Catskill ; St. Joseph's Academy, Brasher's Falls ; the Christian Brothers' Academy, Utica ; St. Joseph's Academy, Binghamton ; Nazareth Academy, Rochester ; Hogansburgh Academy, Hogansburgh. Many others have made application, but are not yet admitted. Such has been the growth of this movement in the interior of the State as regards our Catholic schools. How do we like the system ? Greatly. We suffer no interference on the part of the State officials concerning our methods or our internal management ; for the sole test is the success of our pupils in their examinations. Our teachers are not questioned as to their religion, nor is there any objection made to their religious habit ; our schools retain all their rights in the matter of text-books to be used and of subjects to be studied. We have clerical supervision in the matter of special studies not included in the regents' course. We observe

our holy-days without protest or interference from any one. We have our prayers and devotions, our catechism and our Bible history, and no one objects. There is no objection as to our use of religious emblems; all this is left to the judgment of pastors and teachers. We retain them in every class-room, and there is no question raised as to their presence.

It may be asked what are the advantages of being under the regents? There are many. We would place before all other considerations the breaking down of prejudice. Our separated brethren look more kindly upon us, in proportion as they come more in contact with us. They realize that we are anxious for the improvement of our children; that we do not wish to keep them in ignorance, as has been so often said even by well-meaning people, who had no opportunity of knowing better. They find that our children will compare favorably with the children of other schools in manners, dress, and in all desirable accomplishments. The officers of the regents visit our schools; they learn to appreciate the work of our religious communities, and freely admit that in many cases our parish schools surpass the public schools, even with the public treasury at their back. They have great confidence in the manner in which we live up to the spirit and and the letter of their school regulations. They see for themselves that we are not lacking in the spirit of patriotism and love of American institutions; for our children are taught to refer to the cross of our church and the flag of our country as to allied emblems of freedom and happiness. In the Convocation we are represented by some of our most distinguished Catholic educators, who go there as exponents of our side of this all-important educational question. Our clergymen and religious teachers sit side by side, and exchange views, with the eminent educators who are not of our faith. Time was when we could not obtain a hearing in such assemblies. But we have changed all that. Men are no longer satisfied concerning any question till they have found what Catholics have to say upon that question.

Another great benefit is the removing of prejudices from the minds of our Catholic people. Many of them are accustomed to look upon our Catholic schools as very good places for small children. They admit that the good sisters and brothers are excellent in the work of instilling the principles of religion and morality into the young minds, but they are prone to believe that when called upon to teach the sciences and literature, our Catholic teachers are not up to the standard. This false impression is removed from their minds when they learn from the annual report of the regents that our schools hold their own, and that in many cases they surpass those of our non-Catholic neighbors.

And this is true, even though the course cannot be considered too friendly to our people. To the reasoning mind this result should not create surprise. Our religious teachers are teachers by life-long profession. With them the education of youth is not a temporary occupation, to be exchanged at the first opportunity for something more lucrative, or pleasant, or honorable; it is to engage their attention until death; and every moment is utilized by them in perfecting themselves in their high calling. In consequence, whenever open competition for government appointments and public prizes has been announced, our Catholic pupils have come out victorious; and it is to be borne in mind that such results have been obtained for a small fraction of the *per capita* amount spent upon the least of our public schools.

Another benefit is the healthy spirit of emulation fostered among our children and teachers. They learn to appreciate the systematic examinations of the regents, and soon come to understand the necessity of thorough study if they would be successful. If they wish to continue with their classes they must march on. There is no time to be wasted; the special work for every week of the year is laid out. It is objected that the system tends to cram, and give quantity rather than quality. There may be some truth in the objection, but, of the two evils, give us push and study rather than the creeping system that begins nowhere, ends nowhere, and is forever floundering in the slough of despondency. If we wish to keep pace with the age in all that the age would impart to us, we must adopt the latest and the best methods in every line of study. This we can do in all Catholic schools without sacrificing the education of the heart and the soul. The spirit of emulation is the fruitful source of advancement for our teachers. The fact that the standing of the school is recorded in a printed annual report is a great incentive to the teachers to leave nothing undone to bring the school up to the highest point of excellence. Under this system every pastor is in position to know the standing of his school. Thus the placing of our schools under the regents will have the effect of instilling new life into pupils and teachers. The very conditions are stimulating. To be received into the university the school must have a good working library of standard authors for the daily use of the academic pupils. The collection of books may be increased, from time to time, through the earnest efforts of pastor, teachers, and wealthy members of the parish. This will place within reach of the children the very best literature. They will learn to read the great authors, under the direction of trained minds; and thus, before they leave school, they will have acquired a taste for good reading. There must also be a complete set of apparatus for the study of physics, a chemical laboratory, and a

collection of minerals, charts, globes and the like. All these things tend to make the class-room more attractive, and to make intelligible the subject-matters taught; the pupils become absorbed in their studies and are filled with love for their school. All these things may be expensive and difficult to obtain, but if we wish to attract our children to our schools, we must be willing to make sacrifices so as to give them as good an intellectual training as can be given under any other system.

Here we beg respectfully to differ with those who object to the expense of continuing the higher studies of the Catholic youth under the ægis of Holy Church. Some there are who display a laudable zeal in providing for the thoroughly Christian education of little children, but who, with what appears to us to be a strange inconsistency, are willing to allow the young to complete their studies in an un-Catholic atmosphere removed from the salutary influence of the Church. May it never happen that we shall be constrained to suffer our children to be at any period of their education estranged from Christian direction; but should the dire necessity to make choice be laid upon us, we are not resolved whether we should not consider Christian *higher* education even more important than Christian *primary* and *intermediate* education. The Catholic School is no mere kindergarten. Distinctively Catholic education is the imparting of sublime *verities* to an intellect sufficiently developed to appreciate them, and of pure and severe *morals* to a fallen nature struggling with passions which grow stronger with age. During early childhood, one is lovingly attached to home and parents. Evil influences detrimental to faith and morals increase in power and number when the passions begin to ferment and the youthful intellect to grow wayward and self-reliant. This is precisely the period when the boy or girl ought to be predominantly under the influence of pastor and religious teachers, and jealously secluded from every source of intellectual or moral danger. Then again, we feel that it is unjust, it is inconsistent, it is "a lame and impotent conclusion," after all the expense incurred and trouble endured during these years of primary training, to allow the godless system to claim as its own by right of inheritance those whom Holy Church has labored so hard to bring forth unto Christ: Merely for the sake of economizing the comparatively slight additional expense needed to complete gloriously what was bravely begun!

The fact that our children graduate from their own schools, gives those schools a reputation they could otherwise never secure. Parents become more interested in the work of education as they witness class after class step forth from their Alma Mater, ready to begin the battle of life with intellect, heart, and soul, properly trained.

The regents' system is, therefore a great boon, if for no other reason than that it is a means of keeping our children interested in their studies, and remaining with us until they graduate. But this is not all. It is, though in an inadequate manner, a financial aid to the Catholic clergy and laity in the support of their schools in such details as are most easily overlooked. It prepares the way for a general distribution to all parochial and private schools of the money collected by the State for educational purposes. It familiarizes the authorities with the character of our work. It is an apprenticeship in which we prove our fitness for our work. It brings home to outsiders, as nothing else can, that the institutions of our country need suffer no damage by paying us properly for our work.

The regents' examinations date back to 1822. The members desired then to establish a more elevated course of instruction in the academies subject to their visitations, by defining with greater certainty the various branches of study which should entitle the institutions in which they are passed to a distributive share of the literature fund, and they ordained that no scholar should be considered of academic rank until he were proficient in reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, spelling, and geography. The pupils to be examined are furnished with printed questions. Precautions are taken to secure honest work and reliable returns. All papers claimed by principals to have passed are re-examined at the regents' office. If found correct, pass-cards and certificates are issued to the successful pupils. The allowance from the academic fund is determined by the record of these pass-cards and credentials. Schools are allowed \$5 for each junior certificate of twenty counts, \$5 more for thirty counts, and an extra \$5 for forty counts, and the same for fifty counts; \$10 for an English academic diploma, and \$15 for a classical diploma.¹ The balance of the State fund (\$106,000 annually) is apportioned in proportion to the aggre-

¹ UNIVERSITY CREDENTIALS.—A junior certificate of twenty counts includes physiology and hygiene, United States History, drawing and the six preliminary studies.

An academic certificate may be received for thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy or eighty counts.

The English diploma of fifty counts includes the six preliminary studies,—English composition, English literature, a course of English reading, algebra, plane geometry, physics, chemistry and physical geography. Also botany, physiology and hygiene, English History, United States History, civics, economics, ethics, book-keeping, and drawing.

The classical diploma of fifty counts includes the six preliminary studies; English composition; Latin in the first year; Cæsar's "Commentaries," four books; Cicero's "Orations"; Virgil's "Æneid," six books; Latin composition; Greek in the first year; Xenophon's "Anabasis," three books; Homer's "Iliad," three books; Greek composition; algebra; plane geometry; physiology and hygiene; Greek History; Roman History; United States History.

gate daily attendance in each academy chartered under the regents. On application, assistance is granted for the purchase of books and apparatus of not more than \$150 a year in succession. The amount we receive, though not large, is a great encouragement. If the same principles were applied to the primary departments, it would be a step in advance towards the solution of the great problem. At all events, the Catholics of the State should remember that the regents have made it possible for them to place their Catholic schools on the same footing with all other schools of the State.

It is a step, however short and inadequate, towards righting the great wrong of taxing us for schools to which we cannot in conscience send our children. We hold that education to be dangerous to church, to state, and to the individual which ignores the spiritual life of the child, and we further hold that the Church and the home cannot make up for the loss of such an education as will cultivate the heart and the soul as well as the intellect. We would teach our little ones that first they must seek the Kingdom of God and His justice, and then all things else shall be added unto them.

Why should the State object to this doctrine? If we give the child as good an intellectual training as can be given in the public schools, why should the State object to have the training made more perfect by instilling into the young heart the principles of religious morality? We feel the great injustice of taxation without representation, and we trust our American fellow-citizens will right this great wrong, and grant us now through good-will and brotherly love what must eventually be granted as a patent right.

J. F. MULLANEY.

Scientific Chronicle.

LIGHT-HOUSES AND OTHER AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN THE UNITED STATES.¹

AMERICA was discovered in 1492, but neither Columbus nor his successors seem to have found any light-houses on the coast. The "noble red-man" did not know, probably did not even suspect, that any private advantage was to be derived from such things, and he was never wont to waste his energies on works of mere public utility. For a long time the Europeans who followed in the wake of Columbus neglected, in their mad rush for wealth, to form any permanent settlements; and the governments that fitted out the first expeditions to the New World, had but one object in view, gold; gold to pay their armies and carry on their wars, gold to pamper the "noble" white man, and maintain him in idleness and luxury. So long as the new comers were still leading a nomadic life, light-houses would probably prove an encumbrance rather than an aid, in fact, a sort of luggage somewhat difficult to handle.

After the landing of Columbus, nearly three-quarters of a century elapsed before the founding of the first town, in what is now the territory of the United States, viz.: St. Augustine, Florida; and a half century more before the colonization of Virginia and Massachusetts. The first colonists immediately entered into commercial relations with the old World, and must therefore soon have felt the necessity of beacons to guide their home-returning vessels to a safe anchorage. Hence they must have established light signals of some kind near the entrance of their harbors. Still, strange to say, we find no account of such signals until more than fifty years after the landing at Plymouth.

In the record of the proceedings of the "General Court of the Province of Massachusetts Bay," under the date of March 9, 1673, appears a petition from the good people of Nantasket (now called Hull), praying for the lessening of their taxes, because of the material and labor they had contributed, over and above their proportion, in building the beacon on Point Allerton, the most prominent head-land near the entrance to Boston Harbor. They had furnished 400 boat-loads of stone, for which, as well as for their labor, they were paid by order of the Court, and also for making and furnishing "fier-bales of pitch and ocum for the beacon at Allerton Point." These "fier-bales" were burned in an open iron grate or basket on the top of the beacon. The keeping up of this light must have been rough work in stormy weather, and it was precisely in stormy weather that it was most needed. We

¹ The material for the present article has been drawn in great part from "The Modern Light-House Service," by A. B. Johnson, chief clerk of the United States Light-House Board, Washington, 1890.

have been unable to find the date on which the last "fier-bale" shed its last cheering rays over the waters of Massachusetts Bay.

An interval of forty-two years however, brings us to another record, by which we find that the first real light-house on this continent was built on Little Brewster Island, at the entrance to Boston Harbor, in 1715-16. It was erected by order, and at the expense of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay, at a cost of £2285 17s. 8½d. That last half-penny looks exasperatingly exact, and reminds us of the conscientious scrupulousness with which our own Congress, in 1889, made an appropriation: "For repairs of light-houses, one dollar." How many light-houses were to be repaired for that sum, or how it was to be divided among them, is not stated. The light on Little Brewster Island was supported by light-dues of 1d. per ton, levied by the collector of imports at Boston, on all incoming and outgoing vessels, except coasters. Why this exception was made is not clear, unless perchance it was done as an encouragement to home trade. Our knowledge of this, the Father of American light-houses, is not overpoweringly full. About all we can say is, that, judging from an engraving made shortly after its erection, and dedicated to "The Merchants of Boston" by William Burgis, it was a frustum of a cone, and probably about 150 feet high, with lower and upper diameters of 25 and 13 feet respectively. A two-story house attached to the tower, and having a gable-chimney outside, served as a residence for the keeper.

The other colonies along the coast followed the example of Massachusetts, and when in 1789, the Federal Government, according to the provisions of the constitution just then adopted, took charge of the harbors and navigable waters of the country, the light-houses and all pertaining to them naturally fell into its hands. They were at that date eight in number, spaced along the coast as follows:

Portsmouth Harbor Light, New Hampshire; Boston Harbor Light, Little Brewster Island, Mass.; The Gurnet Light near Plymouth, Mass.; Brant Point Light on Nantucket Island, Mass.; Beaver Tail Light on Conanicut Island, R. I.; Sandy Hook Light, N. J. (entrance to New York Harbor); Cape Henlopen Light (entrance to Delaware Bay), Del.; Charleston Main Light, Morris Island, Charleston, S. C.

All of these lights are still in existence, though so greatly improved that they are the same only in purpose and site. Even this much would tend to show that, in as far as they could go, our ancestors chose wisely and well.

In one hundred years, that is, up to August, 1889, the number increased fully a hundred fold, there being at that date 802 light stations within the limits of the United States. This does not include "post" lights, that is, substantial lens-lanterns suspended on a post, eight or ten feet from the ground, along river banks or in places where a regular light-house would be impossible or unnecessary. Of these there are over one thousand five hundred in use. It will be noticed that the rate of increase of light-houses in the country has been five times as great as that of the population in the same time.

It may be worth while here to give a few figures to show how we stand in this matter in comparison with other lands. There are, as nearly as can be ascertained, about six thousand light stations in the world, distributed as follows:

Europe:

Great Britain and Ireland,	817
France,	444
Sweden,	295
Italy,	244
Norway,	220
Spain,	187
Germany,	179
Turkey,	168
Holland,	166
Russia,	154
Denmark,	132
Black Sea (Russia and Turkey),	88
Portugal,	29
Belgium,	18
Unaccounted for in Johnson's list,	168
	<hr/>
	3309

North America:

United States (exclusive of post lights):

Atlantic Coast,	467
Gulf Coast,	79
Pacific Coast,	38
The Great Lakes,	218
	<hr/>
	802

Dominion of Canada,	443
Newfoundland,	51
Mexico and neighboring States,	33
	<hr/>
	1329

Asia,	476
Oceanica,	319
Africa,	219
South America,	167
West Indies,	106
	<hr/>
	5925

It is not pretended that this list is absolutely complete, as parts of it are made up from statements which are several years old, and it is highly probable, at the present date, that the total number has reached, if it has not surpassed, the full six thousand. A man being placed at a proper distance out in space, could therefore see, on an average, three thousand of our lights at once, and, curiously enough, this is just about the number of stars visible to the naked eye on a perfectly clear moonless night.

The light-house system of a country ought to keep abreast of its commerce, or rather it should keep a little ahead, in order to lure it on. Other things being equal commerce will seek most willingly those ports where its ships can enter as securely by night as by day, and hence all maritime nations have considered the establishment of a good light-house

system as a work of great importance closely connected with the prosperity of the whole land. The commerce of the United States, as indicated by the tonnage of its three coasts, is about one-tenth of that of the whole world, and its coast lights alone (584) are nearly in the same proportion, while if we include the lake commerce the total mounts up to nearly one-seventh, and the lights to almost the same proportion. Finally, if we count in our river trade, we find that we are doing one-fifth of the trading, by water, of the world. This is not a bad showing for an infant of only a hundred years, but it emphasizes the fact that we still need many more light-houses. Great Britain holds to-day one-half of the commerce of the world, we have one-fifth of it, leaving three-tenths for all other nations together. It is no exaggeration to say that our progress during the past hundred years has been rapid, and if we behave ourselves, and don't get into any school-boy fights, we may confidently expect, before the end of our second century, to rival, perhaps to surpass, everything the world has hitherto seen. One of the most important factors in this race for commercial supremacy will be a large-minded, generous policy in regard to the erection and equipment of light-houses.

The true theory of coast lighting is that each coast shall be so set with towers that the rays from their lights shall meet and pass each other, so that a vessel on the coast shall never be out of sight of a light, and that there shall be no dark spaces between the lights. This is the theory upon which the United States is proceeding, and it plants lights where they are most needed, always, however, keeping this idea in view. Hence, from year to year the length of the dark spaces is lessened, and the day will come when all our coasts will be defined, from end to end, by a band of light by night and by well-marked beacons by day.

One essential element in all this business is, of course, the cost. The statistics available for the consideration of this point, and which have been published from time to time by the treasury department, begin on July 1, 1790, and end on June 30, 1890. Later ones have not yet come to hand, but these, giving, as they do, the record for exactly one hundred years will suffice for our present purpose. The total expenses of the light-house establishment during that time was \$93,238,925.80, but the amounts for each year have varied widely. Thus, the smallest sum expended in any one year was \$12,061.68, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1793; the largest sum, that for the year 1889-90, was \$3,503,994.12; the ratio of the lowest to the highest being therefore as *one to two hundred and ninety*. In a general way, the expenditure has gone on increasing from year to year, according as the extent of our territory has increased and its population become more dense and its resources been developed; but there have been some marked retrograde movements. For instance, in 1804-5 the expenditure was, in round numbers, \$122,000, but the following year it went down to less than \$89,000; by 1813 it had risen to \$128,000, but the second year after it was only \$48,000. This may have been due, in part at least, to our "unpleasantness" with Great Britain during those years. Since 1815 we have

never spent less than \$100,000 a year, and, strangely enough, the great crisis of 1837 had no seeming effect whatever on the light-house appropriations. In 1853-4 the expense had reached to the sum of \$1,310,978.42, and it has never gone below a million dollars a year since that date, except from 1860 to 1864, during most of which time the Confederacy was kindly taking care of a certain number of our lights, and so we were spared both anxiety and expense. Since 1864 it has never fallen below two millions, except once, and even in that case but slightly. The expenditure for 1889-90 (which we have given above) would more than cover the first twenty-six years of our light-house existence.

To give a more comprehensive view of our subject we are obliged to inflict on our readers another dose of arithmetic. According to a statement rendered to the Light-House Board on August 15th, 1889, by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the water frontage of the United States measures in statute miles as follows :

General sea-coast :

Atlantic Ocean,	2043
Gulf of Mexico,	1852
Pacific Ocean,	1810
Alaska,	4750
	<hr/>
	10,455

Including islands, bays, etc., to the head of tide-water :

Atlantic Ocean,	36,516
Gulf of Mexico,	19,143
Pacific Ocean,	8,900
Alaska,	26,376
The Lakes (about),	3,000
	<hr/>
	93,935

Of this immense distance, which is almost four times the circumference of the earth, and considerably more than one-third of the distance to the moon, 11,533 miles are illuminated by light-houses. On an average, therefore, each of our 802 lights is responsible for $14\frac{1}{2}$ miles of coast, and to light up our entire shores to the same degree would require eight times as many, or over 6000 light-houses. Evidently, there is plenty of work ahead and plenty of room to work in.

In the foregoing enumeration we have not included the "post" system of river lighting. The river light is treated as separate and distinct from other lights, and is put in a class by itself, being temporary as to its life and shifting as to its place, since its most frequent use is to mark the position of accidental obstructions or the changes in the river banks themselves. The aggregate navigable length of our principal rivers is put down at 4477 miles, supplied (June 30, 1889) with 1557 post-lights, that is, about 1 for every three miles. In most light-house districts (of which more anon) post-lights are to be found, but they are established and maintained from a separate fund, at a cost of about \$150 a year for

each light, whereas the running expense of a light-house will average nearly \$2000 for the same time. They have been found to serve their purpose admirably, and, on account of their cheapness, they are being multiplied rapidly. For the year 1889-99, Congress appropriated \$254,000 "for establishing, supplying, and maintaining post-lights" at various points on twenty-five of the rivers of the country, and the amount has doubtless been increased since that date.

Where a post-light would be absurdly inadequate, and where, at the same time, a light-house is necessary but has not been built, either because of the great difficulty or of the expense, recourse is had to another expedient—the light-ship. As its purpose is to do the work of a light-house, it should have the permanency and efficiency of the light-house. To secure either of these is a matter of great difficulty. When moorings have been made too heavy to drag, chains have broken; when they have held, mooring-bits have been torn out; when neither would give, the ship has foundered at her anchors, unless she sought a harbor or put out to sea for safety. But a light-ship away from her moorings is worse than no light-ship at all, because it is in heavy weather that she is most needed. However, with modern improvements in riding-gear, these things seldom happen now-a-days.

We have between thirty and forty light-ships; the smaller, sligher-built ones being moored in sounds and bays, the larger in the open ocean, sometimes 20 to 30 miles from land. The finest of these ships are from 120 to 150 feet in length, cost from \$50,000 to \$70,000 to build, and from \$5000 to \$8000 for yearly maintenance and repairs. On account of this large outlay the government is trying to replace them, as far as possible, with light-houses.

Besides lights, many other aids to navigation have been devised, such as buoys, bells, whistles, fog-horns, etc.

The buoy is to the seaman, by day, what the light is at night, and what the fog-signal is in thick weather. It tells him by its size, form, color, and number, how to avoid rocks and shoals, and shows the way in and out of harbor. Buoys are of wood or iron. The wooden buoys are spars of spruce, pine, or cedar, from 12 to 60 feet long and a foot or more in diameter. To the larger end is attached an iron sleeve-and-eye, to which the mooring-chain can be fastened. They are classified according to their length, thickness, and color. They cost from \$15 to \$50 each.

Iron buoys are made hollow, with air-tight compartments, and are of three shapes, called nun, can, and ice buoys. The nun buoy is nearly a complete cone in the upper part and almost a hemisphere in the lower. The can buoy differs from this in having the upper part nearly cylindrical; in both the height is from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 times the diameter. They vary in height from 5 to 10 feet, and cost from \$50 to \$150 each. The ice buoy resembles somewhat the wooden spar-buoy, but it is thicker in the middle portion of its length, and tapers toward each end. A 40-foot ice buoy will stand 17 feet out of water; a 50-foot one, 22 feet; they cost from \$180 to \$275 each. Moorings for buoys are either blocks of

stone, or iron, or regular anchors. Chains have been used from the beginning to connect the buoys to their moorings, but latterly ropes of iron wire are being substituted for the chains, especially in the deeper waters and the more exposed situations.

By Act of Congress, September 28, 1850, it was prescribed that red buoys with even numbers should be placed on the right-hand side, and black buoys with odd numbers on the left-hand side of channels approached from seaward; that buoys placed on wrecks or other obstructions, having a channel on each side, should be painted with red and black horizontal stripes; that those buoys placed in mid-channel, and which are to indicate that they must be passed "close-to" to avoid danger, should be painted with red and black vertical stripes; and finally, that perches with balls, cages, etc., should be placed on buoys to indicate a turning-point, the color and number of the buoy showing the side on which they are to be passed.

Buoys are exposed to many dangers, not the least of which is that of being run down and ripped open by passing steamers. As the iron buoys are made with compartments, they are rarely sunk, but their buoyancy is lessened and their usefulness to that extent impaired. Spar buoys frequently lose a portion of their length, which is cut off by strokes of colliding propeller-blades. In spite of State and national statutes to the contrary, vessels will sometimes make fast to buoys, thus gradually dragging them off their bearings. A buoy has sometimes been set adrift that a reward might be obtained for its recovery, but this kind of "rough gambling," as it has been called, is hardly profitable. It requires too many confederates and the danger of detection is too great. The buoy's worst enemy, however, is ice, when moving in mass with a tide or current. A well-made, well-moored buoy, at the mouth of a narrow river can create an ice-gorge; but usually, when the ice moves in force, the buoys have their mooring loops torn out, their chains broke or their anchors weighed; in each case the buoys are carried out to sea, when the buoy tenders give chase, and if successful in their capture, return them to position. The sea-going qualities of buoys are very good, and they have at times made long volunteer voyages. One is now anchored off the coast of Ireland, where it was picked up, about six months after it had been wrenched from its place in New York harbor. Its arrival was duly reported by the Irish Lighthouse Board, but in deference to its longing for the "ould sod" it was presented to the Irish board, and is now the only genuine American-Irish buoy.

Wooden spar-buoys and iron ice-buoys are rarely, if ever, carried away by the ice; they "duck under" and let it pass. In the winter of 1880-81, New York harbor was twice swept clean of all other buoys, some of which were recovered, but many of them were never heard of again. Notwithstanding the great expense of such accidents as these, the importance of keeping that harbor and bay well marked, has moved the board to keep the buoys in position, all the year round, though in places of less importance the nun and can buoys are towed to a place of safety for the winter.

There were, in 1889, in the several districts, 4309 buoys. The appropriation for that year was \$325,000.

Lights by night and buoys by day are the only signals needed when the weather is clear, but nobody needs to be told how inadequate they are when the weather is thick with fog. When sight fails we must have recourse to some other of our senses, and as smell, taste and touch are unavailable at long ranges, all that is left is to fall back on the sense of hearing. About all known sources of sound, which seemed to give any promises of practical results, have been tried, and it is difficult to decide which is the best or which the worst among them.

Guns were used formerly much more than at present, and the testimony as to their usefulness is very conflicting. Admiral Sir A. Milne said he had often gone into Halifax harbor in a fog as dense as a wall, guided solely by the sound of the fog-gun. Professor Henry says that a fog-gun was used at Point Boneta, San Francisco Bay, in 1856-57, and that by its help, vessels which otherwise could not have entered, came into the harbor during the fog, by night as well as by day. The gun was fired every half hour, night and day, during foggy weather, and this amounted to 1582 discharges in one year. Yet it was replaced by a trumpet, and this in turn by a first-class siren.

A gun was also used at West Quoddy Head, Maine. It was five feet long, with a bore of five and one-quarter inches, and was charged with four pounds of powder. It could be heard from two to six miles, but says Professor Henry: "The signal was abandoned because of the danger attending its use, the long intervals between successive shots, and the brief duration of sound, which rendered it difficult to determine its direction with accuracy."

Numerous careful experimental tests were made in England, under the direction of Professor Tyndall, to determine the efficiency of the gun as a fog-signal. The summing up of the results was: "The duration of the sound is so short that, unless the observer is prepared beforehand, the sound through lack of attention rather than through its own powerlessness, is liable to be unheard. Its liability to be quenched by local sound is so great that it is sometimes obliterated by a puff of wind taking possession of the ears at the time of its arrival. Its liability to be quenched by an opposing wind, so as to be practically useless at a very short distance to windward, is very remarkable." In the face of these facts Tyndall gravely concludes: "Still, notwithstanding these drawbacks, I think the gun is entitled to rank as a first-class signal." In the United States the gun has, we believe, been practically abandoned as far as the lighthouse is concerned, but, as a signal of distress, the minute-gun at sea holds its time-honored place the world over.

Even were the gun much more efficient than it has proved to be, it could scarcely be mounted or safely be used in an isolated rock lighthouse. In such cases an explosive rocket has been prepared. A charge of from two to six pounds of gun-cotton is enclosed in the head of a rocket which is projected to a height of 1000 feet, when the charge is exploded. The sound has been heard for a distance of twenty-five miles.

It labors, however, under the same difficulty as the sound of the gun, being too brief to be located with certainty.

Gongs are used to some extent in Europe, especially on light-ships. They are effective for very short ranges only, say a half-mile or less, and have been but little used in this country.

Fog-bells are in use at most United States light-stations, whether ashore or afloat. Some of them are worked by hand, others by machinery. Of the latter class there are about 125 on our costs. They weigh from 300 to 3000 pounds, and experiments shows that their range can be considerably increased by increasing the rapidity of the bell-strokes, and also by the use of a reflector. For the larger bells the effective range varies from one to three miles, according to the force and direction of the wind. As a coast signal the bell is hardly reliable even in calm weather, while in a storm, the noise of the surf will often drown its sound to seaward altogether. On shipboard, however, the use of bells at regular intervals during fog is required by the international code of all nations. Turkish ships, however, are allowed to substitute a gong or gun, as the use of bells is forbidden to the followers of Mohammed.

The steam-whistle, used as a signal, is simply a gigantic locomotive or steamboat whistle. It is described by Price-Edwards as an instrument producing sound "by the vibration of a column of air contained within the bell or dome, the vibration being set up by the impact of a current of air or steam at high pressure." It is probable that the metal of the bell is also set in vibration, and that these secondary vibrations give to the sound its timbre or quality. Difference in pitch is obtained by altering the distance between the steam orifice and the rim of the bell. When these are brought close together the sound is very shrill, but it becomes deeper as the distance between them is increased. The diameter of the whistle is from 16 to 18 inches. It is operated by steam at a pressure of from 50 to 100 pounds. In the latest and most improved forms the steam is admitted and cut off automatically, at intervals determined beforehand, and so the whistle will continue to give forth intermittent sounds as long as the steam supply is kept up. The intensity of the sound depends on the size of the instrument and on the steam pressure employed; the range varies with these conditions from 3 to 20 miles. Despite their high price (about \$200 each), they are coming into extended use in this country.

The whistling buoy is a pear-shaped, hollow, iron bulb, measuring 12 feet across at its widest part, and floating 12 feet out of water. A tube nearly 3 feet in diameter passes from the top of the bulb, through the bottom, and reaches to a depth of 32 feet in the water below. The tube is open at its lower end, but the upper end is controlled by two valves, one opening inwards, the other outwards. As there is no communication between the tube and the air in the bulb, the rise of the water in the tube does not materially affect the buoyancy of the apparatus. The working is after this manner. When the bulb rises on the wave the column of water in the tube falls, and in doing so it draws air in through one of the valves at the top. When the bulb descends with the wave

the column of water in the tube rises, compresses the enclosed air and forces it out through the other valve to a whistle fixed above. These buoys have been heard, under favorable circumstances, to a distance of 15 miles, and the sound is described as "inexpressibly mournful and saddening." The mournfulness of the sound is undoubtedly due to the ever varying intensity of the note, and this is due to the ever varying pressure of the air current.

A whistler of the size named above will weigh about 12,000 pounds. A smaller one has, however, been tried and has been found quite satisfactory. It has a diameter of 6 feet, with a tube only 10 feet long, and weighs but 2000 pounds. It has the advantage over the larger model of being available in much shallower water, of putting less strain on its mooring-gear, and therefore of being less liable to go away on unauthorized holidays; while, at the same time, its song is nearly as strong and fully as mournful as that of its bigger brother. Of all sizes, there are sixty odd of these whistling buoys on our coasts. On an average, they cost about \$1000 each; but, once established, the running expenses are slight, except when they run away. They do their own blowing, and do it cheaply and well.

Buoys carrying bells have been known for a long time. Some hundreds of years ago, when pirates on the high seas were almost as numerous as merchantmen, there was such a buoy off the east coast of Scotland, on the spot where the great Bell Rock Light House now stands. This place was at that time called the Inch Cape Rock, and Southey tells us in rhyme of the ups and downs of its buoy. Aberbrothock was, and is, a little town 58 miles N. N. E. of Edinburgh. It contained an abbey built in 1178, by William the Lion, King of Scotland, in honor of Thomas à Becket, who had been martyred eight years before. The abbey was plundered and destroyed by the Reformers in 1560. Now, let us listen to a few lines from Southey:

"It was the Abbot of Aberbrothock
Who placed that bell on the Inch Cape Rock.
On a buoy in the stream (?) it floated and swung,
And over the waves its warning rung,
And every ship that came to that rock
Would bless the Abbot of Aberbrothock."

Then, one fine day, an honorable pirate, Sir Ralph the Rover, sailing out on a one-sided trading expedition, through sheer malice, determines to destroy the signal:

"Quoth Ralph: 'My men, put out the boat
And row me to the Inch Cape float.'
The boat is lowered, the boatmen row,
And to the Inch Cape float they go.
Sir Ralph leans over from the boat
And cuts the bell from the Inch Cape float.
The bell sinks down with a gurgling sound,
The bubbles rise and burst around.
Quoth Ralph: 'The next who comes to the rock
Won't bless the Abbot of Aberbrothock.'"

The pirate then sails away, and, by strict attention to business, soon gets rich and returns ; but nearing the coast in a dense fog :

“The vessel strikes with a shivering shock ;
Oh heavens ! it is the Inch Cape Rock.”

The Hon. Sir Ralph was drowned, and it served him right. The bell-buoy established by the good Abbot, at his own expense, was a primitive affair, a wooden buoy, with a bell swung by a hempen rope. Improvements have been made since those days, and, in our waters, Sir Ralph, or Sir Any-body-else, would have need of something more than a sheath-knife or a cutlass to dismantle a bell-buoy.

In our present practice, a hemispherical iron cup, more than 6 feet across, is decked over with iron, and a heavy weight is swung beneath it to keep it righted. On the deck is erected a triangular, skeleton pyramid, made of heavy angle-iron and standing 9 feet high. To the inside of this, and near the top, a 300-pound bell is securely fastened. To the frame a circular iron plate with deep grooves running radially is attached quite close to the rim of the bell, and on the plate is laid a free cannon ball. As the buoy rolls on the sea the ball rolls on the plate ; but as it can move only in the direction of the grooves, it must strike the bell fair at each motion, and so produce a sound the intensity of which is in proportion to the force of the blow. The bell-buoy, therefore, just as the whistling-buoy, sounds the loudest when the sea is roughest, but the bell-buoy is adapted to shoal water where the whistling-buoy could not ride, and if there is any motion at all in the sea, the bell-buoy will give some sound. Hence the whistling-buoy is used in roadsteads and the open sea, while the bell-buoy is preferred in harbors and rivers where the sound-range needed is shorter, and where smoother water usually obtains. In 1889 there were 70 of these bell-buoys in the waters of the United States. They cost about \$350 apiece.

The speaking-trumpet is well known, and requires no description here. It is a powerful instrument for magnifying sound and for carrying it to considerable distances, but we are still waiting patiently for the man who will explain the secret of its power. At any rate, it is but natural that it should be tried as a fog-signal. It is unnecessary however, to say that, when it is intended for this purpose, we do not rely on the human voice as the source of sound. In practice, the sound is produced by a vibrating reed, or by a siren, of which latter more anon.

The fog-trumpet is a conical tube 17 feet long, with a throat $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter and a flaring mouth more than 3 feet across. In a resounding cavity back of the throat is fixed a steel tongue 10 inches long, $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches wide, one inch thick at its fixed end, and half that at its free end. When air, condensed by suitable machinery, is driven, under a pressure of from 15 to 20 pounds, through the trumpet, the tongue vibrates vigorously, and a shriek is given forth which has sometimes been heard to a distance of 15 miles. One drawback to this instrument is that there is too much complication about it, requiring, as it does, a condensing apparatus worked by a steam-engine or some equivalent.

Besides, the tongue is an unruly contrivance and is liable to give trouble ; so that great care is needed in the management of the instrument, and even in skilled hands it is liable to fail at a critical moment. For this reason it has not come into extended use in this country. Why the engine and condenser could not be dispensed with, and steam be driven directly through the trumpet has not been made clear. We claim no patent however for the suggestion.

The siren, as an instrument of physics, was invented by Cagniard de Latour. It was adapted to be used as a fog-signal by A. and F. Brown, of New York, under the direction of Professor Henry. Across the throat of a huge trumpet, similar to the one described above, is fixed a dish having 12 radial slits. Behind this and covering it, is a thick plate with the same number of similar openings. This plate is capable of rotating in close proximity to the dish. The slits in the rotating plate are not sawn perpendicularly to its face, but slantwise, in consequence of which, when a current of air or steam is driven through, the reaction against the edges of the slits causes the plate to rotate. The principle is the same as that on which the wind pressure against the slanting sails of a wind-mill causes the wheel to turn. In some instruments, we believe the plate is made to rotate by an independent piece of mechanism. This necessitates the employment of a motor, and complicates the instrument undesirably. In either case, when a slit in the rotating plate comes opposite to a slit in a fixed disk, the steam passes freely through ; when a slit in the plate comes opposite to a solid portion of the disk, the current is arrested. This alternate starting and stopping of the current sets up vibrations in the air, and when these succeed each other with sufficient rapidity, we have sound. Under a pressure of 70 pounds of steam, a nicely balanced plate will turn at the rate of 2400 times a minute ; and since there are 12 slits, we get 28,800 vibrations in that time. This corresponds to about the note *b* above the *a* of the normal tuning-fork. The volume of the sound is so great that it can be heard under favorable circumstances to a distance of 20 or 30 miles. "Its density, quality, pitch and penetration render it dominant over every noise, after all other signal-sounds have failed."

The average of all the tests show that the relative power of the different kinds of fog-signals may be expressed thus : siren 9, whistle 7, trumpet 4 ; and the relative cost of fuel to run them, thus : siren 9, whistle 3, trumpet 1. Their relative efficiency therefore, as regards the mere matter of fuel, would be : siren 3, whistle 7, trumpet 12 ; but it would be a grave error to conclude that therefore the trumpet is the best and the siren the worst. For, it must be borne in mind that in a dangerous place where the siren would just suffice to ensure safety, the trumpet or whistle would toot in vain.

In 1889 there were in operation in the United States, on light-ships, in light-houses and at other points, 81 fog-signals worked by machinery. They were set up at a cost of over \$600,000 and are maintained at a yearly outlay of more than \$100,000. These may seem large sums, but we must not forget that the loss of a single large steamship would far outweigh them all.

There are, connected with our light-house system, many points of general and scientific interest, about which we would be glad to say a few words, but we have trespassed so far already on the patience of our readers, that we must forbear. Still we must beg leave to add just a word about the light-house administration.

Our Light-house Board is composed of two navy officers, of high rank, two army officers of the engineer corps, two civilians of high scientific attainments, a navy and an army officer, to act as secretaries, making in all eight persons, besides the Secretary of the Treasury, who is *ex-officio* president of the board. The board has full charge of all existing light-houses, and other aids to navigation, but additions thereto, and all appropriations, both for current expenses and for new work, must come from Congress.

The whole country is divided into sixteen "Districts"; but poor Alaska is not included, being, as it were, left out in the cold.

Subordinate to the board, are the inspectors, always chosen from the ranks of the navy, and the local engineers, chosen from the army. Each district is provided with one inspector and one engineer. Their duties are sufficiently indicated by their titles. They receive no pay except their regular navy or army salary, according to their rank.

Light-house keepers are required to undergo a three months' trial in the service, and to be examined as to qualifications, before receiving a regular appointment. The salary varies from \$100 to \$1000 a year, according to the importance of the post. The appropriation made by Congress for 1889-90 was \$625,000, being the amount estimated sufficient for the payment of the 1150 keepers and assistant keepers then employed.

On the whole our light-house system is one of the institutions of which the country may be modestly proud.

A GREAT DAM.

We are all acquainted with the innate modesty of the average American. He cannot bear to admit that anything is ever done abroad equal to what is done at home. And yet, at times, we come across engineering feats in other countries which cast into the shade his proudest achievements in the same line. An example of such a work is the great dam just completed in far-off India, and which is said to be, by all odds, the largest masonry dam in the world. It was not built for a boast, nor for any ornamental purpose, but for the very useful one of supplying water to the city of Bombay. The dam is about seventy miles distant, in a northerly direction from the city, and is constructed straight across the valley of the Tansa. The length of the dam is two miles, its greatest depth 118 feet, its thickness at the bottom 100 feet, narrowing to 16 feet at the top. The two faces of the dam are of cut stone, the space between being filled with rubble stone and cement, so that the whole forms

one solid mass throughout. Great care was taken to reach a solid foundation that would be proof against settling, and consequently dangerous strains and cracking. For this end, it was found necessary to excavate nearly 7,000,000 cubic feet of rock. The true masonry work amounted to about 11,000,000 cubic feet; the rubble work to 15,000,000 cubic feet; the sand, lime, and cement, to 6,000,000 cubic feet more; so that the entire contents of the dam reaches the enormous total of 32,000,000 cubic feet. A special difficulty in the undertaking arose from the lack of transportation facilities, so that all the sand, lime, and cement, as well as tools and machinery, had to be brought by animal power a distance of many miles.

From 10,000 to 12,000 men, with a proportionate number of animals, were employed during six working seasons of seven months each (*i.e.*, from October to May), so that the whole time was 42 months, or just $3\frac{1}{2}$ years. When the basin formed by the dam is filled, it will cover an area of 8 square miles, and is calculated to contain about 100,000,000,000 gallons, and to be capable of supplying 100,000,000 gallons a day the year around. The water is to be conducted to Bombay in iron pipes four feet in diameter, each section of which weighs about four tons. As there is no danger of freezing in that country, the pipes have been laid above ground. The engineers and contractors were from Edinburgh, while the pipes were supplied by a firm from Glasgow. The work has been done in the most thorough and substantial manner, and if no earthquakes attack it, there seems to be no reason why the dam should not be everlasting.

ELEVATOR NOTES.

Hardly anything is more typical of modern business life, in large American cities, than the passenger elevator. According as a city becomes more densely populated, its expansion upwards must advance more rapidly than its lateral expansion. On the other hand, this expansion skyward could not profitably take place, except to a very limited extent, were it not for the invention and perfection of the passenger elevator. Who, for example, would rent rooms for offices, or, indeed, for dwelling places, if, to reach them, he had to climb a stairway a hundred, two hundred, or three hundred feet high? If, however, access can be had to such rooms by an elevator, then they become at least as valuable as rooms lower down.

The passenger elevator may be considered as an evolution of the dumb-waiter, which we have had with us so long. The evolution consisted in an increase of dimensions, the application of a sufficient motive power, and the means of governing that motive power from within. In another line, the dumb-waiter developed into the freight-elevator, operated first by hand, and later by water-power or steam-power. The freight-elevator, however, was too heavy, clumsy, and slow, to be used for passengers. The real passenger elevator has been in use only a com-

paratively short time, but in that time it has proved its worth so far as to render possible such structures as the *Tribune* and *Times* buildings in New York, and the monstrous edifices that have gone up, or are going up, in the city of Chicago.

The speed at which elevators are, or may be run, depends, of course, in the first place on the amount of power employed. It also depends on the distance to be traversed; for, where the distance is short, there is less time to get up head-way. In ordinary office buildings, the speed is about 300 feet a minute, which is scarcely at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour. A journey to the moon, in this way, would take about eight years, travelling day and night, Sundays and holidays included. But elevators have not yet been built quite so tall as that.

The elevators in the Union Trust Company's building, New York city, are capable of making from 600 to 900 feet a minute, provided the load be not over 3000 pounds. In a shaft 250 feet high a speed of 1500 feet a minute, which is equivalent to a mile in about $3\frac{1}{2}$ minutes, may be attained, but to most people the sensation experienced during the acceleration and the slowing up, either in ascending or descending, is far from agreeable. With the improvements made quite recently in the running-gear, and in the means of guarding against accidents, it is just as safe to run fast as slow. The Masonic Temple, now in course of erection in Chicago, will have twenty-four elevators, built around a circular shaft, and having a rise of 250 feet. Some of them will be used as express elevators, going the whole distance, up or down, without a stop, but the maximum speed will probably not be attempted, for the reason given above. Others will stop at every fourth or fifth landing; others, at every landing; finally, others will be used exclusively for freight.

The largest elevator cars in the world are said to be those of the North Hudson County Railway, at Weehawken, opposite New York City, on the Hudson. Three separate elevators are provided, each of which is intended to carry 135 passengers, the weight of whom, says the report, is equal to 10 tons. This would give an average of 148 pounds to each person. We thought New Yorkers were bigger than that. A viaduct, 875 feet long, reaches out from the hill to a point 150 feet above the ferry-house, whence rises the shaft, thus sparing the passengers a long and toilsome climb, and a climb is always up-hill work.

THE RAMIE FIBRE ONCE MORE.

Some time ago, we said a word about the ramie fibre as a substitute for iron in the manufacture of steam-pipes. No further developments have been made public in this direction; but a few notes, in part from the *Pacific Lumberman*, about its employment in the manufacture of cloth, may be useful—perhaps interesting.

The experiments were made at the woollen mills of San José, Cali-

fornia. The fibre was put through the same processes as any other material used in the manufacture of cloth. It went through the picking, carding, roping, and spinning machines, from which it came forth thread. Next, it went through a special machine by which a thread of ramie and a thread of wool were twisted into one. This compound thread, says the statement, was then put into the loom and turned into cloth. It would seem from this, that the thread was used both as web and filling, though this is not clearly stated. The fabric was strong, and so compact that when held up, light could not be seen through it.

Ramie is said to be more than forty times as strong as cotton; hence, it is evident that a fabric made of mixed wool and ramie must be far superior to the ordinary mixture of wool and cotton. The fibre, when prepared for use, has a creamy white color, and almost a silken lustre, which it retains even after the process of dyeing. It looks better, and wears better, than any other fabric, except perhaps silk, and can be produced at a very much lower price. In the light of these facts, we have asked ourselves why the fibre should not be used pure, without admixture of wool or anything else, and we confess that we are still waiting for an answer.

The cultivation of ramie is of the easiest description. It grows with the prolificness of a weed, and seems to thrive best in a soil which is too poor for any other crop; the climate, however, of our northern States is too cold for it; but in the southern States it will give three crops a year, at a profit of at least \$200 an acre, and one planting will last twenty years. We venture to predict that, in the near future, the cultivation of ramie will be undertaken on a large scale, and that King Cotton will have to abdicate and give place to King Ramie.

MOTIVE POWER AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

According to the *Electrical Review*, the chief motive power for the machinery at the World's Fair will be supplied by a gigantic engine, to be furnished free to the Exposition by the E. P. Allis Company, of Milwaukee. The engine will be furnished as a part of the company's exhibit, upon a special contract providing that it shall be used for the motive power, *and that no other engine of equal size shall be exhibited.* We confess that we do not quite understand how the second part of this contract can be valid. Who gives, or can give, to the managers of the World's Fair the right to discriminate between individuals as to their exhibits? The only possible valid reason why another firm should not be allowed to put in a larger engine would be because it had failed to make application for space before the time-limit for such application had expired. In that case, the clause we have italicized would be useless. Anyhow, it is to be an engine of the quadruple-expansion type, and is to be of about 4000 horse-power.

Quadruple-expansion? what is it? Well, when steam is admitted into

the cylinder of an engine, in virtue of its pressure it forces the piston to move forward. If the supply of steam is cut off, as it always ought to be, before the piston has reached the end of its stroke, the steam already admitted will expand and continue to urge the piston forward, though, of course, with decreasing force. In doing work, that is, in driving the piston forward against resistance, the steam loses some of its heat, but this loss should not be enough to cause it to be condensed into water, for water, being incompressible, is a dangerous nuisance in a steam cylinder. While the piston is returning, on its back-stroke, the steam which caused the forward stroke must be got rid of. What entered as steam must therefore be expelled again as steam, but at a lower temperature, and at a reduced pressure. Now, if this be allowed to escape into the air, it is so much heat lost, and therefore so much coal lost. Millions of dollars are wasted in this way every year. Some of this heat-energy may, however, be saved by making the exhaust-steam heat the feed-water for the boiler. An engine, in which steam thus acts on one piston, and is then allowed to escape, is called a *single-expansion* engine.

But better results may be obtained by causing the steam which has already acted on one piston to pass on to a second cylinder and have a whack at *its* piston. Here the steam is at a lower pressure, and consequently, to be effective, it must have a larger surface on which to act. The second cylinder must, therefore, be larger than the first. An engine built on these lines is called a *double-expansion* engine, and by its use a very great saving may sometimes be made. If again, we allow the exhaust-steam of the second cylinder to expand into a third one, we have the *triple-expansion* engine, and another similar step brings us to the one of *quadruple-expansion*.

At each stage there should be a saving; and by the time the steam leaves the last cylinder it should be so far used up as to have only just enough energy left to get out of the way. All the pistons in an engine of any one type work together, and, with the cylinders, valves, etc., constitute but one engine. These *multiple-expansion* engines are fast replacing the older type, especially in the case of large plants; and, in them we have probably nearly reached the limit of what is possible with the fuel-water-steam engine.

We have said that the Allis engine for the World's Fair is of the *quadruple-expansion* type, and that it is rated at about 4000 horse-power. This means that it could lift, against gravity, 66,000 tons, or from 20 to 25 of the largest light-houses of the world, at the rate of one foot a minute, or, in other words, could raise that weight more than a quarter of a mile in 24 hours. The great Corliss engine, used at the Centennial Exposition was not half so powerful.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK. By *Charles Kendall Adams*, LL.D. New York. 1892.

"At the northwest corner of the Italian peninsula the coast-line, as it approaches the French border, bends around to the west in such a way as to form a kind of rounded angle, which, according to the fertile fancy of the Greeks, resembled the human knee. It was probably in recognition of this geographical peculiarity that the hamlet established at this point received some centuries before the Christian era the name which has since been evolved into Genoa." When Dr. Adams wrote these two sentences,—the opening sentences of his book,—he was the President of Cornell University. We quote him in recognition of his literary peculiarities, and, at this point, to establish the fact that one may write English clumsily and cloudily, and yet be evolved into a University President.

Within a twelve-month a crowd of poor writers have fallen foul of Christopher Columbus. As an excuse for their dull books, they charge Washington Irving with having written too well. A man who writes well cannot be scientific, say the presidents, professors, librarians of the universities; therefore *We* are pre-eminently scientific historians. And besides, Irving was a man of feeling, of perception, who could understand a great man. No scientific historian should be able to enter into the soul of any human being; hence Irving was lamentably unscientific. A splendid apology for dulness, incompetence, dryness, these university men have evolved.

Dull and dry as Dr. Adams is, he is more reliable than some others who enviously seek to belittle Irving. The ex-president's book, one can see, was written solely because a publisher invited him to turn out a volume in a speculative series. And the publisher invited the Doctor to write, not because he had anything new to say about Columbus, but because he was, at the time, President of a University. Now that he is an ex-president his book has a value, as a curiosity.

About Columbus, his life and his work, worse books have been written. A critical historian would not have said all that Doctor Adams says; for he says, occasionally, what he cannot substantiate; and a truthful historian would have said more than the Doctor says, for his analytic and synthetic powers are very limited. He repeats a story often told—repeats it lifelessly, school-boy fashion. Having no imagination the author is at the mercy of his plain, little—red—school-house self. Had he a proper training, it is evident that he could edit a classical author; but for picturing, measuring live men, Dr. Adams is not fitted.

Of the history of the fifteenth century the ex-president knows very little; of the history of Spain during the fifteenth century he knows less. He has written a book which the publishers meant to be "popular." It is in fact a school-boy's book that school-boys will not read. Irving, considering his time and his prejudices, gave us a rarely good life of the discoverer of America. Dr. Adams has not done better.

The *true* life of Columbus has been written. Unless time uncovers documents that are hidden, a *complete* life of the great man cannot be written; but the details that we lack are of little importance, if we except one fact now made over-much of,—his second marriage. The discoverer of the New World needs no defence other than that which the

truth of history offers; and in our October number, THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW intends to contrast the Columbus of history with the Columbus of the recent universalists, so that seekers after truth may know the truth, and avoid the false.

PHASES OF THOUGHT AND CRITICISM. By *Brother Azarias*. Houghton, Mifflin & Company: Boston and New York. 1892.

A new book by Brother Azarias means a new pleasure, a new friend; thoughtful friend, learned, wise and wholly devoted to our welfare. Hence it is that we welcome each new book of the studious, earnest Brother of the Christian Schools, who has been untiring in his efforts to spread sound principles among a loose-thinking generation. In "Phases of Thought and Criticism," we have a handbook of the science of right-thinking; and an exemplar of the higher literary criticism, which, dealing only with masterpieces, analyses, criticises, not beauties or defects of form, but the soul of the artist, the ideals that inspire him, the lesson that he teaches.

To the first eighty-eight pages of the "Phases," we apply the title: "Handbook of the science of right-thinking." Here the philosophic author considers, first of all, the soul and its activities; and next, "thinking,"—what it is, what it is not; the "principle" of thought; the "habit" of right-thinking; the influence of our pursuits upon our habits of thought. Apt illustration enforces the principles enunciated; and the value of the thought of many noted teachers, ancient and modern, is justly estimated. Happily has Brother Azarias chosen Emerson and Newman, as subjects for a chapter, in which, giving us "a glimpse of the inner chambers of the mind" of a thinker, whose limitations were narrow, and whose training was most imperfect, we are enabled, by comparison, to appreciate duly the great Englishman, whose breadth of mind, acuteness, logical force, and passion for truth assure him a lasting and deserved fame.

The "ideal in thought,"—the reality of the ideal, the importance of the ideal to the perfection of all the arts, true realism, the delusions of the "School of Realism,"—these subjects of so great importance to the student of literature and to the writer, are clearly and agreeably handled by our eminent Catholic thinker, whose work has been ever inspired by the highest of ideals. The "ideal" implies the supernatural, the spiritual, the moral: and these again imply the higher life, the spiritual life. No true spiritual life, says Brother Azarias, without the cultivation of the "Spiritual Sense," noblest of the soul's "activities";—for the Spiritual Sense "takes in all the truth, goodness and beauty, of both the natural and revealed orders, and views them in the light of Faith." To aid a reader in cultivating the Spiritual Sense, and to show how all great thinkers are great only in as much as they have cultivated the Spiritual Sense, our author here analyses and criticises three of the world's masterpieces: the *Imitation of Christ*, the *Divina Commedia*, and the *In Memoriam*.

You have read the *Imitation*, and perhaps you have read a biography of the author, Thomas à Kempis. And yet even after close study of the book and the man, Brother Azarias will give you a better understanding of the one and the other. The man is limned in the book; the book is the man. And the man was not merely a spiritual man but also a man of learning and a literary artist. The ideal and scope of the *Imitation*, the sources from which it was drawn, the line of thought, the fitness of the expression, 'the secret of the magic influence' of the

book, are patiently studied and serviceably, admirably explained. From "Phases of Thought" many will learn, for the first time, how great an artist as well as thinker was Thomas à Kempis.

From the work of a religious who wrote calmly in a solitary's cell, we turn now to "a work indited amid the storms of passion and tribulation, and withal bearing a deep spiritual meaning"—the *Divina Commedia*. Leo XIII., who has so often said the right word at the right time, recently directed the attention of Catholic scholars to Dante's sublime epic, which non-Catholics, infidels and indeed the most bitter enemies of the Church, wresting it from its true purpose, have used as a weapon of assault on her, and as an instrument for the dissemination of falsehood. English-speaking Catholics are almost wholly at the mercy of non-Catholic writers,—translators, annotators, explicators, critics of the *Divine Comedy*; and therefore we welcome Brother Azarias's study of Dante and his time, analysis of the three masterly poems on Hell, Purgatory and Paradise, and summary of the "philosophy and doctrine that are the foundation of their Spiritual Sense." The Brother's extensive reading, delicate and true perception, and simple, pleasing art of expression have never been more happily combined; and this study is bound to attract, as it deserves to attract, wide attention.

A "world-poem" our critic declares the "In Memoriam" to be. A great poem it is, certainly, and yet far below Dante's, and hardly comparable with it. Much lower in ideal, lesser in conception, weaker, smaller in execution, Tennyson's masterpiece, considering the times, the man, his surroundings, and the occasion of the poem, is worthy of the painstaking and original study for which we are indebted to Brother Azarias. The work of seventeen years,—and thus long Tennyson toiled over the "In Memoriam"—is not to be measured in a day or a week. An elegy, a poem almost wholly personal, it may be as the author of this study truly says, "not unfitly called a lyrical drama of the soul." A thinker, serious but uncertain, grasping after Truth, attaining it only in part, satisfied now with half-truth, now with falsehood,—such a thinker is Tennyson. To be able easily to trace his thought and teaching, and whence he has derived his thought, and to what goal his teaching leads; to admire the truth he has worked out of sorrow, to correct his errors, and at the same time to enjoy his exquisite art,—all this Brother Azarias has made possible. Doing this, he has made all readers and students of the poem indebted to him. The study is a scholarly piece of work of which Catholics may well be proud. Work of this character is not only immediately but also permanently useful. It is an exemplar, ever teaching students what is good work, and how they must work if they would be recognized as scholars.

LE CAPITAL, LA SPECULATION, ET LA FINANCE AU XIX. SIECLE, Par *Claudio Jannet*, Professeur d' Economie Politique a L' Institut Catholique De Paris. Librairie Plon., Paris, 1892.

Though economical questions are so freely discussed nowadays, much of the discussion is not intelligent. To have value, a judgment of the prevailing economical system, or of any part of it, should be based on a thorough acquaintance with actual conditions and actual methods. M. Claudio Jannet, always practical, has in his latest work, carefully delineated the world of finance, the world of commerce, the world of industry, just as they are. What is good in them, what is evil, he makes clear. The evil that may be and should be corrected, he points out. False theories, false inferences, he discovers. A sound scholar, sound philosopher, sound moralist, knowing the past as well as the present, he

is always the safest of guides ; and nowhere has he used to better advantage his knowledge, or more serviceably applied scientific and ethical principles, than in this volume.

Were it not for the exaggerations of the socialists and of many other "reformers," we should have less reason than we have to find fault with the existing economical order. False doctrines, misrepresentations of facts, misconceptions of all sorts, mislead great numbers of men and distract them from what is immediately desirable and possible. In the present order there is more to praise than to blame. It is not so much the mechanism that is at fault, but greedy men who abuse it, and men too careless or ignorant to use it beneficially.

The development within recent times of capital, of commerce, of manufactures, of banking, of credit, of markets, and of speculation, has been extraordinary. The wonder is that we should have so readily adapted ourselves to changes so unforeseen, so rapid. And the era of change has not come to an end ; but we shall accommodate ourselves to the future as we have to the past. The changes that have taken place have not made the rich richer and the poor poorer, as the demagogues commonly say. Increase of wealth, M. Jannet shows, has been accompanied by the dissemination of wealth, and by a general, constant elevation of the mass of men.

To the inexpert, the author's chapters on commercial and stock speculations must prove not only interesting but also instructive in many ways. The purpose and the organization of the various "Exchanges," the character of the transactions habitual there, are described in detail. How these various transactions affect prices ; which of these transactions are legitimate, moral ; which are illegitimate, immoral, M. Jannet explains. The tricks of speculators he exposes, warning the unshorn "lamb" to keep far away from the shearer. Even the most expert will find these studies valuable, covering as they do not only the methods in vogue in England, and on the Continental Exchanges, but also in the United States. M. Jannet handles and resolves many delicate questions while treating of modern speculation ; and he has written an admirable chapter on business morality ; a chapter whose illustrations are drawn from many countries. Indeed throughout the volume, facts notable, recent, abound ; and our own country furnishes the learned author with material that will be new to many readers, and that is happily chosen.

It is not many years ago since our bankers tried to pass a new proverb upon us : "A national debt is a national blessing." Blessing or not, all our modern governments have acted very much as if they accepted the American bankers' proverb. To the social consequences of their public debts, M. Jannet devotes a chapter, wherein he discusses the character of the various loans customarily issued, showing their advantages and defects ; the improper methods that have been used in many countries, the disastrous effects of these methods, the profits, tricks, connivances of the combinations of great bankers who control these loans, as well as of public officials who devise them. Every intelligent man, whatever his calling, would be served by reading this chapter. Democracies have been exploited by clever men, just as kingdoms and empires. Citizens who are informed can do something to protect themselves and the country. If we are content to be ignorant, we must be satisfied with suffering and groaning.

The financial and political power of the great banking interest in this nineteenth century, few give a thought to. The voter is an uncertain factor, the financier is a certain, positive factor, whom it is well to

know. And M. Jannet has pictured him to us, in his great exemplar, the Rothschild, ruler of States. With his house in the lead, it is the Jews who finance the world. Their power and how they use it, their wonderful organization, the marvellous intelligence, foresight, they have displayed in meeting all the developments of new political and economical conditions, the problems they have made for us, and their moral standards—all these, the Professor of Political Economy at the Paris Institute, has presented with abundance of fact, carefully, moderately.

M. Jannet's work is up to the times in every respect, and must find a place in the library of every economist, professor and student. Bankers, brokers, manufacturers, tradesmen will be served by it. To theologians, students of ethics, students of history, it will be welcome. The scope of the work is large, and the plan most original. Catholics have laid on them to-day a special duty: to know the moral principles determining all the various operations of business, to practice those principles, and to spread a knowledge of them far and wide. If we are to be saved from worse things, preserve peace, allay the spirit of socialistic revolution, elevate society—there is only one way. M. Claudio Jannet points the way. How long shall we have to wait for a body of American workers, who, following his methods, shall endeavor to raise the standard of economical education among all classes of our people?

DIE GOTTGEWEIHTEN JUNGFRAUEN IN DEN ERSTEN JAHRHUNDERTEN DER KIRCHE :
von *Joseph Wilpert*. B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis.

The united talents of one of the most distinguished of Christian archeologists and of one of the princes of Catholic publishers have given us in this charming book, magnificently printed and illustrated, the very gem of recent Catholic literature. Mgr. Wilpert, writing as a labor of love a work for the edification of the nuns of his beloved Innsbruck, has chosen for his subject what De Rossi has very neatly and correctly designated "*il fiore dell' archeologia Cristiana*," that of "consecrated virgins in the first centuries of the Church." The subject has also the charm of novelty; for this interesting topic had been but meagrely treated.

The brilliant young writer has brought to bear upon his task the manifold talents of pen and pencil with which God has blessed him in an eminent degree. In addition to the folios of the Fathers, he has gleaned much valuable information from the frescoes, inscriptions and monuments of the Catacombs; and he has invested what in inferior hands might have been a dry antiquarian dissertation, with that interest which only one thoroughly master of his subject and in deep sympathy with the institution which he describes can impart.

The work is divided into two sections. In the first, the author's intimate acquaintance with early Christian literature enables him to present a most graphic and fascinating picture of the holy nuns of the first ages; the deep veneration in which they were held; their vow of perpetual virginity and the ceremonies attending their entering upon the consecrated state; their dress and canonical age; their rule of life; the development of religious communities; and, lastly, the noble reward which, in the estimation of all Christians, awaited them in heaven.

The second section of the work is devoted to the reproduction and explanation of frescoes and other remains of primitive Christian art bearing upon the subject. The accompanying plates are of exceptional excellence; the first especially well deserving De Rossi's encomium that

"it is the best copy of a painting in the Catacombs which has yet appeared."

One rises from a perusal of Wilpert's book with increased veneration for that loveliest of Christian institutions, perpetual chastity. Were there no other evidence at hand of the identity of the great Catholic Church of to-day with the Church of Cyprian, Jerome and Augustine, their common reverence for virginity and the number of consecrated "brides of Christ," who in all ages have renounced the allurements of wealth and rank to lead lives of voluntary poverty and chastity would be quite sufficient to prove that the Church ever remains guided by the same Unchanging Spirit. Now, as in the days of Cyprian, these holy women who have bound themselves voluntarily and joyfully to lives of perpetual chastity are regarded as "God's image answering to the holiness of the Lord, the most illustrious portion of Christ's flock."¹

We hope that the enterprise of Herder will not allow this valuable work to serve for the edification and consolation of Germans only. It ought, without delay, to be translated into English, that its sphere of usefulness may be extended. Our religious women, though amply supplied with ascetical and devotional works, are badly in need of just such productions as this of Wilpert, which appeal directly to the understanding; and as our excellent Sisters are by training and habit of a literary bent, such appeals to their reasoning powers are the most powerful means of awakening their devotion.

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Father Matteo Liberatore, S. J.* Translated by Edward Heneage Dering. London Art and Book Company. 1891. Received from Benziger & Co.

Old age has nowise dulled the keen intellect of Liberatore; though it is touching to read the passage where he intimates a doubt of his being left to finish even this little book. The value of the work is not to be measured by its size; its chief merit is that it points out the true path to younger feet. Of all modern sciences, political economy needed just such a teacher as the veteran Catholic philosopher who, in the school of St. Thomas, had grown gray in pondering the right use of words. The very definition of the science had been left vague and unsatisfactory. The first care of Liberatore, therefore, is to subject every term used to a vigorous inspection; and, half the time, when terms are rightly understood, every difficulty has vanished. After defining his subject to be "the science of public wealth, with regard to its rightful ordering as a means of common well-being," he adopts the usual division under the three heads of the production, distribution and consumption of wealth. He reduces the producers of wealth to two, viz., nature and the labor of man. Capital he defines to be "a store of savings, destined for production"; it is not a producer of wealth, rather the effect of production; it is a powerful instrument in the hands of the true producer.

Liberatore insists throughout upon the supremacy of morality over this science of wealth and upon the dignity of man as a moral agent. "Political economy," he says, "is not the science of multiplying wealth anyhow. Were it so, fraud, robbery and the pillage of the conquered would have to be included among its means." He is equally indignant that the laborer should be degraded to the category of machinery.

"Work, or the production of wealth, is not the end for which the workman lives. He works to live, and whoever says that he lives to

¹ St. Cyprian On the Dress of Virgins, c. 3.

work likens him to a machine, or, at the most, a brute." He demands that remedies be speedily found to obviate, or at least diminish, the evils caused to the liberty and intelligence of workmen by present economic conditions, the minute subdivision of labor and the use of machinery. The operative is entitled to previous instruction and education. "No child should be put to permanent mechanical work until his bodily strength is developed and sufficiently consolidated by age, and his mind by instruction, most especially in morals and religion." Secondly he urges: "Limit the hours of labor, not only for women and children, who ought not to work more than six hours, but also for adults. In no factory should the operative work more than nine, or, at most, ten hours in the day; so that he may have leisure for the cares and affections of home, and raise his thoughts to things befitting the dignity of human nature. But, above all, his freedom to abstain from material work on Sundays and holidays ought to be kept intact in order that he may have time and opportunity to fulfil his religious duties and strengthen his good resolutions."

Such a doctrine, while it undoubtedly "will not be acceptable to the sense-worshippers and self-worshippers, who find in human society nothing higher than wealth, to be produced anyhow in the highest possible quantity, and see in the operative nothing more than a machine, to which indeed they compare him in their treatises,"—will appear self-evident to all who really believe in the common brotherhood of men and the priceless dignity of immortal souls.

We should like to see this book in the hands of all our young men, that they may be persuaded that Christianity alone, and Catholic Christianity at that, is the only disinterested friend of the people. In *Liberatore* they will find an admirable commentator upon Pope Leo's encyclical, "On the Condition of Labor."

DARWIN AND AFTER DARWIN. An Exposition of the Darwinian Theory and a Discussion of Post-Darwinian Questions. By *George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.* Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 1892.

This volume, the author tells us, "is devoted to the general theory of organic evolution as left by the stupendous labors of Darwin." To the believing Christian, the most interesting pages are those which contain the author's views as to the bearings of "science" on religion. It is consoling to observe that his researches have failed to offer him the slightest evidence that mankind have been mistaken in ascribing the creation and government of the world to a personal, intelligent and beneficent God. That God is a mysterious and incomprehensible being was well known and proclaimed ages ago. We do not ask modern science to furnish us with new arguments to prove His existence, much less do we look to scientists for an explanation of the divine attributes. We are satisfied if they will have the humility to confess with Professor Romanes, that "while the sphere of science is necessarily restricted to that of natural causation, which it is her office to explore, the question touching the *nature of this natural causation* is one which as necessarily lies without the whole sphere of such causation itself; therefore, it lies beyond any possible intrusion by science." It is simply due to mental cowardice that "scientists" stop short when their microscope fails them, and refuse to follow the clear vision of reason into the region of things invisible. The learned author is wrong when he insinuates that there is no supplement to physical science except faith; for, besides faith, there is the solid ground of metaphysics. However, we repeat that it is a great consolation to find so devoted a follower of Darwin

and so distinguished a leader of the evolutionists as this Oxford professor undoubtedly is, conceding to simple-minded men, that for aught he knows to the contrary, God still rules the universe. There is something pathetic, akin to a wail, in his concluding sentences: "But I have endeavored to show that the logical standing of the case"—for the existence of a supreme beneficent Being—"has not been materially changed; and when this cry of Reason"—the unreasonable Reason which chafes at mysteries—"pierces the heart of Faith, it remains for Faith to answer now, as she has always answered before—and answered with that trust which is at once her beauty and her life—Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." With a little more faith in his own reasoning powers and less slavish dependence upon his microscope the able author would soon reason himself into Christianity. It is only the superficially educated "scientists" who have the hardihood to glory in their ignorance of the highest of scientific truths.

IGNAZ VON DÖLLINGER; EINE CHARACTERISTIK. Von Dr. Emil Michael, S. J.; Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch, 1892.

The purpose which the able professor of church history in the University of Innsbruck set before him in writing this book was to allow the historical Döllinger to pass judgment upon the mythical hero whom the enemies of Holy Church have been substituting for him. What a noble personage that mythical Döllinger is! How utterly inadequate the vocabulary of adulation to sound his praises! He is the very Prometheus of modern culture in his bold defiance of the papal Jupiter! The thunder and lightning of the Vatican roar and blaze about his hoary head with impotent fury. There he stands where truth and knowledge and conscience had planted him: *Döllingerus contra mundum!* Sublime, if true. We should have been more likely to be carried away by such rhetoric if it had not grown stale by long usage. But was there ever a heretic since the days of the Apostles who was not characterized by his deluded followers in precisely the same manner! There seems to be just enough of diabolical depravity infused into the tainted blood of fallen humanity to make us always prone to resist authority and to sympathize with rebellion. Yet heresiarchs of all generations, from Simon Magus and Arius to Luther and Döllinger, preserve the same unmistakable type—an overweening self-conceit, a sublime disregard of consistency, a calm assumption of personal infallibility, a boundless contempt for the living rulers of Holy Church and utter unscrupulousness in all their charges and assertions.

Beginning at the beginning, Dr. Michael, with admirable analytical skill, traces the downward course of the unfortunate Döllinger from his promising youth to his wretched old age, bestowing with due impartiality blame and praise. In his first section, *Internal Revolt*, the author points out the gradations through which Döllinger, the Infallibilist of 1838, was metamorphosed into the venomous *Janus* of 1869. Then follows the sorrowful *Open Rebellion*, then the breaking up of "Old Catholicism," until the unhappy career ends in *Isolation*. It is, indeed, a doleful story which no charitable heart can follow without a pang, and the story is told by a man whose spirit is as kindly as his analysis is merciless.

It speaks well for the ability and the opportuneness of the study that the first edition was exhausted at its very appearance. Let it soon appear in an English dress.

RITUS ORDINATIONIS JUXTA PONTIFICALE ROMANUM. Curante Adm. *Rev. J. S. M. Lynch, D.D., LL.D.*, Olim in Seminario Provinciali apud Trojam, N. Y. Sacræ Liturgiæ Professore. Editio Secunda, Correcta et Ampliata. Cum Appendice. Impensis Bibliothecæ Cathedralis, Neo Eboracensis, Madison Avenue, 460.

The Rite of Ordination, According to the Roman Pontifical. By the Very Rev. *J. S. M. Lynch, D.D., LL.D.*, formerly Professor of Sacred Liturgy in St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary, Troy, N. Y. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. With Appendix. The Cathedral Library Association, 460 Madison Avenue, N. Y. 1892.

The Latin text, mentioned above, and the English translation of it are bound together in one volume, each page of the Latin text being followed by a corresponding page of the English translation.

This most useful and important work is published with the approval of the Very Rev. Dionysius J. McMahon, Theological Censor of Books, confirmed by the declaration of the Most Rev. Michael Augustine Corrigan, Archbishop of New York, that this translation of "The Rite of Ordination, according to the Roman Pontifical, having been found to agree with the original, can be published by the Cathedral Library Association."

The work, as its title indicates, contains full and detailed directions, as well as the full and complete text (both in Latin and in English) of the ceremonies for the Making of Clerics, the Ordination of Pastors, of Readers, of Exorcists, of Acolytes, of Sub-Deacons, of Deacons, and of Priests.

To candidates for the priesthood preparing for ordination, and also to the laity who desire to assist intelligently when they witness the impressive ceremonies, this work cannot fail to be highly useful.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR, COLLECTED FROM DIFFERENT SPIRITUAL WRITERS AND SUITED FOR THE PRACTICE CALLED "QUARTER OF AN HOUR'S SOLITUDE." Edited by *Rev. Roger Baxter, S.J.*, of Georgetown College. Second edition. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1892.

"This book (the editor tells us), was first written in Latin, in 1639, by N. B. (an English Religious), and handed around in manuscript for years, during the times of persecution in England, where it was used by many holy persons. It was translated into English in 1669 by Rev. E. Mico and revised and modernized in 1822 by Rev. Roger Baxter, S. J., of Georgetown College." The work, then, is doubly precious. It is precious for its own sake and again for its antiquity. Of this book it may be truly said, "though old, it is ever new." In our humble esteem it is the equal, we had almost said the superior, of any work of the kind now in use. In the preface to the first American edition, the editor tells us the book was a particular favorite with such men as Bishops Challoner and Walmsley. That alone were highest recommendation for any work. We warmly recommend this little book to all and wish it the splendid success its high value calls for.

GOLDEN RULES FOR DIRECTING RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES, SEMINARIES, COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, FAMILIES, ETC. By *Rev. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R.* A new and revised edition. Fr. Pustet, Printer to the Holy See and the S. Congregation of Rites. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This is a new edition of an old and highly prized work. The writer, Rev. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R., is well known and deservedly held in great esteem in the Catholic community, for he is the author of many other most excellent books. Whilst primarily intended for the Superiors

of Religious Houses, it will, we are sure, be appreciated by, and prove most valuable to all in authority. To the priest in the confessional, and the pastor in the direction of his people, it is alike invaluable. It is, moreover, a book that should be in the hands of Catholic parents, first for their own sake, and secondly for the sake of the children, whom God has placed in their keeping. We have every hope that this new edition will be favorably received and appreciated by English speaking Catholics.

MEDITATIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF RELIGION AND ON THE HIDDEN AND PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By *The Most Rev. Dr. Kirby*, Archbishop of Ephesus. Rector of the Irish College at Rome. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1892.

This is a book intended primarily for the clergy and ecclesiastical students. It is a development or explanation of the "Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius." It is indeed more than a development of those admirable "Exercises," for whilst drawing the matter and order of his meditations from the "Exercises," the Most Rev. author has given them a new and most practical value by his happy and learned applications of Scripture texts. We like very much the author's references to the Blessed Virgin.

Every priest should have this book on his desk. It will be largely instrumental to his own sanctification, and of invaluable assistance to him in his high office of preaching and directing souls.

FASTI MARIANI: Sive Calendarium Festorum Sanctæ Mariæ Virginis Deiparæ, memoriis historicis illustratum: auctore *F. G. Holweck*. Friburgi: Herder. Price, \$2, net.

This slender volume aims at giving a comprehensive survey of all the festivals established among Christians, as well in the Holy Catholic Church as in the schismatic churches of the East. The meaning, origin and time of establishment are succinctly narrated under each day, following the order of the calendar. The work is an expansion of articles which appeared in 1888 in our excellent contemporary, the "Pastoralblatt" of St. Louis, to which diocese the learned author belongs. He has given the clergy a very valuable and instructive book, conveying a mass of information not easily accessible.

A MARTYR OF OUR OWN TIMES. Life of Rev. Just de Bretenières, Missionary Apostolic, Martyred in Corea in 1866. From the French of *Rt. Rev. Mgr. D'Hulst*, Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris. Edited by Very Rev. J. R. Slattery, Rector of St. Joseph's Seminary. Baltimore, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.

The subject of this biography, along with Mgr. Berniex and two other Catholic missionaries, joyfully suffered martyrdom on the 8th of March, 1866, in Corea. The early evidences he gave of his possessing a true vocation for the priesthood; his life and employments at St. Sulpice, and at the seminary of Foreign Missions; his voyage to Corea, the trials and hardships he endured; his indefatigable zeal and his heroic death, are well described in the volume before us.

THE CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS. By *Lelia Hardin Bugg*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

We sincerely wish that a copy of this most useful little work were in the hands of every Catholic in our country and were carefully read by him or

her. It consists of brief, plain, practical directions as to what is the correct thing for Catholics to do, and not to do, under almost all conceivable circumstances—at Confession, Holy Communion, Confirmation, at funerals, respecting marriage engagements, at weddings, at church, during Lent, during Holy Week, when visiting convents or clergymen, etc. The book is, for the purpose for which it is intended, one of the very best works that we know of.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE CATACOMBS. By *Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.*, Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.

We cannot too highly commend this unpretentious but excellent little volume. In brief space it conveys a great amount of information respecting the silent, but clear and conclusive, testimony borne by the inscriptions and other monumental evidences in the catacombs to the veneration rendered by Christians of the earliest ages to the Holy Mother of God. The work is not prepared primarily for learned scholars, but rather for the general public to whom the results of modern scientific research on the subject are not easily accessible.

A SCHOOL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

This neat little volume of 254 pages is splendidly illustrated and written in a highly interesting style. Large or small, it is one of the best Catholic histories of the United States that has yet appeared, and so far from dealing with only a few important events it is remarkably complete. It is admirably adapted to every grade in our parochial schools.

SOUVENIR SKETCH OF ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA. HARDY & MAHONY. 1892.

This little book was written by Rev. Wm. Kieran, D.D., the learned rector of St. Patrick's congregation, as a memento of the golden jubilee of his grand old parish. The story of its fifty years of existence is exceedingly well told and the book is well illustrated. It would greatly facilitate the work of future historians of the Catholic Church in America, if all our pastors would issue similar memorial volumes.

HORÆ DIURNÆ BREVIARIÏ ROMANI. Editio secunda post typicum. Fr. Pustet: Ratisbon and New York. 1892. Price, \$5.

No pains have been spared to make this really superb, large octavo edition of the little hours perfect in every respect. It will be very acceptable to those of the clergy whose advancing years and diminishing keenness of vision forbid the further use of small print.

MISSALE ROMANUM. Quarto edition. Pustet & Co: Ratisbon and New York. 1892.

In this sixth reproduction of the *editio typica* the latest Masses will all be found in their proper places, dispensing with the great inconvenience of loose leaves and dislocated feasts.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- MANIFESTATION OF CONSCIENCE. CONFESSIONS AND COMMUNIONS IN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES. A Commentary on the decree "*Quemadmodum*" of December 17, 1890. Translated from the French of Rev. *Pie de Longogne, O. M. Cap.* With the original decree and the official translation. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.
- TALES AND LEGENDS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. From the Spanish of *F. de P. Capella*. Olive and Other Tales, from the French. The Father's Right Hand, and Nannie's Heroism, The Bric-a-Brac Dealer, from the French. Benziger Brothers; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.
- FIFTY-TWO SHORT INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF OUR HOLY RELIGION. From the French, by Rev. Thomas F. Ward, Rector of the Church of St. Charles Borromeo, Brooklyn N. Y. Benziger Brothers; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.
- PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Charles Gide*, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Montpellier, France. Translated by Edward Percy Jacobson. With an introduction by James Bonar, M.A., LL.D. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- THE STATE. ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL AND PRACTICAL POLITICS. A Sketch of Institutional History and Administration. By *Woodrow Wilson*, Ph.D., LL.D., Author of "Congressional Government." Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1892.
- ELEMENTS OF CHEMISTRY, DESCRIPTIVE AND QUALITATIVE. By *James H. Shepard*, Professor of Chemistry, South Dakota Agricultural College, and Chemist to the United States Experiment Station, South Dakota. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- COLUMBUS, THE GREAT DISCOVERER OF AMERICA. A Drama in Five Acts. By an Ursuline. (Dedicated to the Right Rev. I. F. Horstman, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland.) New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.
- POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Charles S. Devas*, Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland, Author of "Groundwork of Economics," etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.
- THE BIRTHDAY BOOK OF THE MADONNA. Compiled by Vincent O'Brien, Editor of "The Birthday Book of the Sacred Heart." Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.
- THE LITTLE BOG-TROTTERS; or, A FEW DAYS AT CONMORE. By *Rosa Mulholland*. With Numerous Illustrations. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.
- MY ZOUAVE. By *Mrs. Barile Teeling*, Author of "Roman Violets," etc. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.
- ADELAIDE, QUEEN OF ITALY; or, THE IRON CROWN. An Historical Tale. By *Wm. Bernard McCabe*. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co.
- FLORINE, PRINCESS OF BURGUNDY. A Tale of the First Crusade. By *Wm. Bernard McCabe*. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co. 1892.
- THE STOLEN CHILD. By *Henrick Conscience*. Translated from the original Flemish. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.
- STUDIES IN AMERICAN HISTORY. By *Mary Sheldon Barnes* and *Earl Barnes*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1891.
- HISTORISCHES JAHRBUCH IM AUFTRAGE DER GORRES-GESELLSCHAFT, Munich. 1892. April number.
- THE AMERICAN CITIZEN. By *F. Dole*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

PERIODICAL

70750

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

